

## Heroes of the Nations

A Series of Biographical Studies presenting the lives and work of certain representative historical characters, about whom have gathered the traditions of the nations to which they belong, and who have, in the majority of instances, been accepted as types of the several national ideals.

---

12°, Illustrated, cloth, each, 5/-  
Half Leather, gilt top, each, 6/-

---

FOR FULL LIST SEE END OF THIS VOLUME

# Heroes of the Nations

---

EDITED BY

Evelyn Abbott, M.A.

FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD

880

FACTA DUCIS VIVENT, OPEROSAQUE  
GLORIA RERUM.— OVID, IN LIVIAM, 265.

THE HERO'S DEEDS AND HARD-WON  
FAME SHALL LIVE.


## ROBERT THE BRUCE











LOCH TROOL.  
*photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee*


# ROBERT THE BRUCE

## AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE

BY

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL, BART., M.P.

AUTHOR OF "MERIDIANA," "LIFE OF W. H. SMITH"  
"SCOTTISH LANDNAMES," ETC.



G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

NEW YORK

LONDON

27 WEST TWENTY-THIRD STREET

24 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND

*The Knickerbocker Press*

1903

COPYRIGHT, 1897, BY  
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS  
Entered at Stationers' Hall, London

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

BY THE GRACIOUS PERMISSION  
OF  
HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS  
**Albert Edward,**  
PRINCE OF WALES AND EARL OF CARRICK,  
THIS WORK IS  
MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED TO HIM  
BY THE AUTHOR.





## PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

I HAVE been charged with want of patriotism in writing too confidently about the homage exacted from Malcolm Canmore for Lothian and Cambria. In spite of the close attention which has been devoted during the last hundred and fifty years to this delicate point, unanimity among historical students seems as far off as ever. In the first edition I gave the impression of probability left on my mind after comparison of every leading authority, namely, that Lothian—the territory lying along the east coast between the Tweed and the Forth—was not reckoned an integral part of Scotland in the eleventh century. That this view does not imply want of patriotism surely appears clear when it is seen to have been the one adopted by such able advocates of Scottish nationality as Heron in the last century and Skene in the present one.

However, as it is almost certain that the doubt hanging round this venerable dispute can never be dispelled, I have taken this opportunity of modifying the references to the Lothian homage in such a way

as to avoid unnecessary controversy. The fact remains that the Scottish Kings were content to pay homage for English fiefs; the precise extent and locality of those fiefs it is impossible to define.


Indignant remonstrance has been addressed to me for having suggested the identity of William Wallace with William le Waleys who, in company with a priest, was alleged to have stolen 3s. worth of beer from a woman in Perth. It is fair to point out that the charge never was brought to proof; even had it been so, it would have sunk into insignificance beside the many cold-blooded crimes with which Blind Harry proudly credits his hero. It is certainly a curious coincidence that Blind Harry states that Wallace was in Perth, *disguised as a priest*, just about the time the theft was committed.

It has been pointed out that in following the version of the Bruce pedigree, compiled by Miss Cumming-Bruce, I am at variance with some other writers who have attained greater proficiency than I can lay claim to in Norman genealogy. Mr. J. H. Round points out that while the de Brus family came from the Château d'Adam at Brix, near Cherbourg, the house of de Braose, which obtained lands in Sussex, originated at Briouze, in the south of Normandy.

Mr. William Brown, in a paper on "The Brus Cenotaph at Guisborough" (*Yorkshire Archæological Journal*, 1895, vol. xiii., pp. 226-261), gives the following pedigree of the family of Brus of Skelton and Annandale, in which it will be seen that the first two


Roberts given in my version of the pedigree (p. 18) and in the Dictionary of National Biography, are returned as one. The cenotaph at Guisborough cannot be considered as earlier than the sixteenth century.

LONDON, July 1, 1897.













## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
CHAPTER I.	
THE MAKING OF SCOTLAND (A.D. 844-1286) . . .	17
CHAPTER II.	
THE DISPUTED SUCCESSION (A.D. 1286-1291) . . .	38
CHAPTER III.	
THE REIGN OF JOHN DE BALLIOL (A.D. 1291-1296) . . .	62
CHAPTER IV.	
THE CAMPAIGN OF WALLACE (A.D. 1296-1298) . . .	82
CHAPTER V.	
THE DEATH OF WALLACE (A.D. 1299-1305) . . .	101
CHAPTER VI.	
THE REVOLT OF ROBERT DE BRUS (A.D. 1304-1306). . .	120

CHAPTER VII.		PAGE
ADVENTURES OF THE KING OF SCOTS (A.D. 1306-		
1307 . . . . .		137
CHAPTER VIII.		
DEATH OF EDWARD I. CAMPAIGNS OF EDWARD II.		
(A.D. 1307-1313) . . . . .		163
CHAPTER IX.		
BATTLE OF BANNOCKBURN (A.D. 1314) . . . .		194.
CHAPTER X.		
INVASION OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND BY THE		
SCOTS (A.D. 1314-1317) . . . . .		224
CHAPTER XI.		
CONTINUED SUCCESS OF THE SCOTTISH ARMS (A.D.		
1316-1319) . . . . .		245
CHAPTER XII.		
INVASION AND COUNTER-INVASION (A.D. 1319-1322)		263
CHAPTER XIII.		
NEGOTIATIONS FOR PEACE (A.D. 1322-1326) . .		287
CHAPTER XIV.		
THE CAMPAIGN OF WEARDALE AND CONCLUSION		
OF PEACE (A.D. 1327-1328) . . . . .		305

---

CHAPTER XV.

PAGE


DEATH OF THE QUEEN OF SCOTS AND MARRIAGE OF THE PRINCE (A.D. 1328) . . . . .	329
---	-----

CHAPTER XVI.

DEATH OF ROBERT DE BRUS. REVIEW OF HIS WORK AND CHARACTER (A.D. 1329) . . . . .	337
--	-----

CHAPTER XVII.

EXPEDITION OF DOUGLAS. HIS DEATH, AND THAT OF MORAY (A.D. 1329-1332) . . . . .	356
INDEX . . . . .	371







## ILLUSTRATIONS.

	PAGE
LOCH TROOL . . . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
THE ABBEY CRAIG AND WALLACE MONUMENT, SCENE OF THE BATTLE OF STIRLING, SEPTEMBER 11, 1297 . . . . .	92
DIRLETON CASTLE . . . . .	96
CAERLAVEROCK CASTLE . . . . .	106
DUMFRIES . . . . .	130
KILDRUMMIE CASTLE . . . . .	138
"THE ROCK OF BLOOD." SITE OF THE CASTLE OF DUNAVERTY . . . . .	144
MAP OF GALLOWAY . . . . .	152
LOCH TROOL NEAR NEWTON STUART . . . . .	160
From a photograph by Mr. Hunter.	
BOTHWELL CASTLE ON THE CLYDE . . . . .	164
CLACKMANNAN CASTLE, THE RESIDENCE OF ROBERT IN 1314 . . . . .	192
STIRLING CASTLE, FROM THE SOUTH-WEST . . . . .	196
MAP OF BANNOCKBURN . . . . .	216
BOTHWELL CASTLE, THE QUADRANGLE . . . . .	224
DUNBARTON CASTLE . . . . .	298
TARBET CASTLE ON LOCH FYNE . . . . .	300
DUNFERMLINE ABBEY. REFECTORY . . . . .	330
DUNFERMLINE ABBEY, FROM THE NORTH-EAST . . . . .	342



	PAGE
DUNFERMLINE ABBEY. NAVE, LOOKING EAST . . .	344
CAMBUSKENNETH ABBEY . . . . .	348
MELROSE ABBEY FROM THE SOUTH-EAST . . .	356
TOMB OF SIR JAMES DOUGLAS . . . . .	362
From Fraser's <i>The Douglas Book</i> , Edinburgh, 1895.	

For the subjects not otherwise specified, the illustrations have been reproduced, with permission, from photographs by Messrs. Valentine Bros., Dundee.

## COINS AND SHIELDS.

	PAGE
SILVER PENNY OF JOHN DE BALLIOL . . . . .	I
From a cast in the British Museum.	
SILVER PENNY OF ROBERT I. . . . .	I
From a cast in the British Museum.	
THE KING OF SCOTLAND . . . . .	17
THE KING OF ENGLAND . . . . .	17
SIR JOHN DE BALLIOL . . . . .	38
SIR ROBERT DE BRUS . . . . .	38
COMYN, EARL OF BUCHAN . . . . .	62
SIR AYMER DE VALENCE . . . . .	62
SIR HENRY DE PERCY . . . . .	82
SIR ROBERT DE CLIFFORD . . . . .	82
SIR JOHN DE MAXWELL . . . . .	101
SIR INGELRAM DE UMFRAVILLE . . . . .	101
THE EARL OF GLOUCESTER . . . . .	120
SIR ROGER DE KIRKPATRICK . . . . .	120
SIR JOHN DE ST. JOHN . . . . .	137
MURDOCH OF CUMLODEN . . . . .	137
PATRICK, EARL OF DUNBAR AND MARCH . . .	163
SIR DOUGAL MACDOUALL OF GALLOWAY . . .	163
SIR GILBERT DE CLARE, EARL OF GLOUCESTER .	194

	PAGE
SIR GILES DE ARGENTINE . . . . .	194
SIR HUMPHREY DE BOHUN . . . . .	224
SIR PHILIP DE MOUBRAY . . . . .	224
SIR WALTER THE STEWARD . . . . .	263
SIR THOMAS GRAY OF HETOUN . . . . .	263
SIR JOHN OF BRITTANY, EARL OF RICHMOND . . . . .	287
SIR HUGH LE DESPENSER . . . . .	287
THOMAS, EARL OF MORAY . . . . .	305
SIR JAMES DE DOUGLAS . . . . .	305
THE EARLS OF CARRICK . . . . .	329
SIR HUGH LE DESPENSER . . . . .	329
SIR HUGH DE MORTIMER, EARL OF MARCH . . . . .	337
JOHN, EARL OF WARRENNE AND SURRY . . . . .	337
THOMAS, EARL OF LANCASTER . . . . .	356
SIR RICHARD FITZ ALAN, EARL OF ARUNDEL . . . . .	356
SIR SIMON DE FRASER . . . . .	370

The shields are reproduced from drawings by Mr. Graham Johnston, of the Lyon Office, Edinburgh.







#### ABBREVIATED REFERENCES TO AUTHORITIES.

- BAIN.—Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland preserved in H. M. Public Record Office. Edited by JOSEPH BAIN. 4 vols. H. M. General Register House, Edinburgh.
- HAILES.—Annals of Scotland, by LORD HAILES. Ed. 1797. 3 vols.
- LANERCOST.—Chronicon de Lanercost. Maitland Club. Edinburgh. 1839.
- PALGRAVE.—Documents and Records illustrating the History of Scotland preserved in the Treasury. Collected and edited by SIR FRANCIS PALGRAVE. Published by the Records Commissioners. 1837.
- RAINE.—Historical letters and papers from the Northern Registers. Edited by JAMES RAINE. Master of the Rolls series. 1873.
- STEVENSON.—Documents illustrative of the History of Scotland, 1286–1306. Selected and arranged by the REV. JOSEPH STEVENSON. H. M. General Register House. Edinburgh, 1870.
- SCALACRONICA.—Scalacronica: by SIR THOMAS GRAY of Heton, Knight. A Chronicle of England and Scotland from A.D. MLXVI to A.D. MCCCCLXII. Edinburgh, printed for the Maitland Club. 1836.





Silver Penny of John de Balliol.

*Obv:* The King's head crowned, and sceptre. IOHANNES : DEI : GRA✠

*Rev:* A cross between four mullets of six points : REX : SCOTORVM✠



Silver Penny of Robert I.

*Obv:* The King's head crowned, and sceptre. ROBERTVS : DEI : GRA✠

*Rev:* A cross between four mullets of five points : SCOTORVM : REX✠

## INTRODUCTION.

IF anyone were to attempt, five hundred years hence, to write the life, say, of Prince Bismarck, and a history of the war between Germany and France in 1870-71, and should be forced to rely exclusively on the newspapers circulating at that time in the two countries, supplemented by a few German and French poems and songs composed about the middle of the twentieth century, and the chronicles of intensely partisan writers, reviewing the causes and events of the war at a distance of sixty or seventy years, he would be far better equipped for his task than one who should have undertaken, comparatively few years ago, to compile a history of Robert I. of Scotland and the winning of Scottish independence.

• He would, of course, have to discount freely the statements of journalists on either side, respecting the causes which brought the war about, and the motives and conduct of those engaged in it; but he would, at least, be able to trace the movements of armies, the identity of commanders, and the conduct

of troops on both sides in the field, by means of the graphic descriptions supplied by war-correspondents.

Now there were no war-correspondents in the campaigns of Robert the Bruce. On two occasions, indeed, the armies of England invading Scotland were accompanied by scribes specially commissioned to record the course of events. One of these, the anonymous author of the *Siege of Caerlaverock*, fulfilled his task with admirable minuteness, and, as the victory lay with his own side, with what may be assumed to be tolerable fidelity. Even he, however, lies open to the suspicion which attaches to all metrical composers, for nobody expects a poet to sacrifice the elegance of a stanza or the neatness of a rhyme to the inexorable limits of hard facts.

On the other occasion the result was not so satisfactory. Baston, a Carmelite friar, rode with the mighty host with which Edward II. intended finally to crush the Scottish nation in 1314. But, unluckily for his patrons, honest Baston was made prisoner at Bannockburn, and paid for his ransom by submitting his long poem, of which he had probably composed the greater part before the battle, to such alterations as made it a celebration of the Scottish triumph.

There were, it is true, many contemporary chroniclers busily at work; but not only were they all, with the exception of the French priest Froissart, writing from an English point of view, but, except Sir Thomas de la More, they were monks, compiling their histories in the seclusion of some cloister, often far from the seat of war, and always unversed in military operations. The dominant motive in such

a history as Pierre Langtoft's was clearly, however unconsciously to the writer, to justify the policy of Edward I. towards Scotland. There is, unhappily, no counter-pleading, written by a contemporary, to set forth the case of Wallace and Robert de Brus.

Nevertheless, the writings of Thomas of Walsingham, Walter of Hemingburgh,\* Nicholas Trivet, and other English scribes are of inestimable worth so far as they go, especially as means have lately been provided of checking some of their statements, and confirming others, by comparison with documents preserved among the public records of Great Britain and other countries. These, thanks to the patient labours of Mr. Joseph Bain, Sir Francis Palgrave, Dr. John Stuart, Mr. George Burnett, and others, have now been arranged, edited, and placed within easy reach of every student in the Calendars and other publications sanctioned by the Lords of the Treasury. Besides these, Sir T. D. Hardy and the Rev. J. Raine have edited in full the papers and correspondence of the northern cathedrals of England, in which the course of the long war is very faithfully reflected. But among the English chronicles of the fourteenth century, there are two which must be mentioned as of special service to the study of the war between England and Scotland.

The first of these is what has come to be known, erroneously, as there is good reason to believe, as the

\* Usually, but erroneously, referred to as Hemingford. A canon regular of the Austin Priory of Guisborough, in Yorkshire, he is named de Hemingburgh in a document of that house, and also in one copy of his own chronicle.



*Chronicle of Lanercost.* It contains a general history of the affairs of England and Scotland, with occasional references to events on the continent of Europe, from 1201 to 1346. In the only manuscript thereof known to exist, this chronicle is appended without any break to the annals of Roger de Hoveden, and appears to have been compiled, not, as was once supposed, in the Priory of Lanercost, but in a place much more favourable for observation of the course of the Scottish war, namely, in the Monastery of Minorite Friars at Carlisle. It is unnecessary to recapitulate the evidence of this, which will be found fully set forth by Mr. Joseph Stevenson in the introduction to his edition of this chronicle, printed for the Maitland Club in 1839. But his view enhances very much the value of the chronicle as an authority on the Scottish war, of which a brother of the Franciscan order, while able to testify as an eyewitness to events in that oft-beleaguered city, Carlisle, would also receive direct and constant accounts from his brethren in the monasteries of Berwick, Dumfries, and Dundee. Hence the value of this history in dealing with the War of Independence, though allowance must be made sometimes for the bitter resentment which the English friar must have had good reason for cherishing against the Scots.

The other work referred to as deserving special attention, though not exactly contemporary, has the peculiar merit of having been written by a layman and a soldier. Sir Thomas Gray of Heton, besides taking part in the public affairs of the reign of Edward III., was the son of that Sir Thomas Gray who

served with great distinction in the Scottish wars under all three Edwards, and was taken prisoner by the Earl of Moray in the skirmish on the day before the battle of Bannockburn. In 1355, Sir Thomas Gray, the younger, was himself taken prisoner, and, while confined in Edinburgh Castle, set himself to compose his *Scalacronica* in Norman French. He knew the ground well on which the various sieges and battles had taken place ; he was thoroughly versed in all chivalrous and knightly lore, and in the art of war as it stood before the introduction of gunpowder. He had become personally acquainted with many of the actors in the scenes he described ; and, of those which had taken place before he reached manhood, he had received accounts from the lips of his father, than whom there could be no more capable authority.

Turning now to the Scottish side of the account, the most important work dealing with this period is the well-known poem entitled *The Brus*, by John Barbour, Archdeacon of Aberdeen. This writer was born a few years after the battle of Bannockburn, and therefore, though not able to describe as a contemporary the early history of his hero, must have conversed with many persons who took part in the events described. It is consequently of the utmost importance to ascertain what degree of reliance may be placed on his veracity.

Unhappily, Barbour's poem, which is of the deepest interest to the philologist as the very earliest extant specimen of Scottish vernacular literature, has been almost irretrievably discredited as a chroni-

cle by a monstrous liberty which the author takes in rolling three real personages into one ideal hero. In this way he has treated father, son, and grandson—all of whom bore the name of Robert de Brus—and gravely presented them as one and the same individual. Barbour was at work on his poem, as he himself informs us, in 1375, forty-six years after the death of Robert I., and it is impossible to doubt that he deliberately and consciously perpetrated the fabrication whereby he made Robert de Brus, the "Competitor," the same as his grandson, Robert de Brus, Earl of Carrick, crowned King of Scots in 1306, and threw into the same personality the intermediate Robert de Brus, Lord of Annandale, who was King Edward's governor of Carlisle during John Balliol's brief war. Such a glaring figment placed in the fore-front of an historical work, might render, and in the eyes of some people has rendered, all that follows it of no historical importance. This great national epic has been denounced as of no more value to history than the romances of Walter Scott or Alexandre Dumas. As the late Mr. Cosmo Innes observed, in editing *The Brus* for the Spalding Club in 1859 :

"It suited Barbour's purpose to place Bruce altogether right, Edward outrageously wrong, in the first discussion of the disputed succession. It suited his views of poetical justice that Bruce, who had been so unjustly dealt with, should be the Bruce who took vengeance for that injustice at Bannockburn ; though the former was the grandfather, the other the grandson. His hero is not to be degraded by announcing that he had once sworn fealty to Edward, and once done homage to Balliol, or ever joined any party but that of his country and freedom."

It must be confessed that, at first sight, little of value could be looked for from such a dubious source. But closer examination reveals that the cardinal falsehood is all disposed of in the first few cantos. The first ten of these may be rejected as irrelevant to any honest purpose. After that, in the description of the coronation of the Bruce, his flight, the detailed account of his adventures, and his subsequent campaigns, the poet shows praiseworthy respect for

" the suthfastnes  
That schawis the thing richt as it was,"

which he declares in his exordium to constitute the superiority of "story" over "fabill." The more closely this part of the narrative is examined, the more fully it will be found borne out by such State papers and other documents as are available for comparison; to which, of course, Barbour had no access. This was enough to convince the critical intellect of Lord Hailes, who, practised as he was in testing evidence, did not scruple to found largely on Barbour's statements.

It is necessary, however, to add a further caution in regard to the witness borne by Barbour on highly controversial matters. Not only was he actuated by the laudable desire to win the applause of his countrymen by showing the leaders of the patriotic movement in the most favourable light, but it was also his interest to pass lightly over anything that might detract from the lustre of the royal house of Scotland. Otherwise the royal bounty might have

been checked at its source. On the completion of his work in 1377, Barbour, as shown by the Exchequer Rolls, received £10 by command of the King. Next year a pension of 20s. annually for ever, with power to assign, was awarded him for the compilation of the book of the "gestis" of Robert de Brus. In 1381 he had a gift from the Crown of the ward of a minor, a curious parallel to a similar gift made by the King of England to Chaucer in 1376. Again, in 1388, King Robert II. granted to the Archdeacon a pension of £10 yearly for life, though this probably was made in recognition of another poem, dealing with the House of Stuart, which has been lost. These substantial rewards might have been jeopardised by inconvenient candour on the part of the volunteer laureate.

The verdict, therefore, on the value of Barbour's poem, as a contribution to history, must be that it is worthless as a record of events which led to the War of Independence, but of great merit as a narrative of the events of that war and of the conduct and acts of those who took part in it, and that it vividly reflects the social state of Scotland in the fourteenth century.

The most important original writer, dealing with Scottish affairs in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, was undoubtedly John of Fordun, who compiled his *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, commonly known as the *Scotichronicon*, in Latin, between the years 1384 and 1387—from fifty-five to sixty years after the death of Robert I. With his own hand he is believed to have completed his chronicle down to

the death of David I. in 1153. Of subsequent years, down to his own death in 1387, he had collected very copious notes, which he left in the hands of Walter Bower or Bowmaker, Abbot of Inchcolm, intending him to bring the history to a conclusion. Other continuators took the work in hand during the fifteenth century; but of course neither their work nor Bower's is of equal value to Fordun's original notes. Of the compilation known as the *Scotichronicon*, the first five books out of sixteen may be safely regarded as the writing of John of Fordun, and the *Gesta Annalia* as the notes which he left with Bower. These were carefully edited by the late Mr. W. F. Skene, and form volumes i. and iv. of the *Historians of Scotland* series.\*

In volumes ii., iii., and ix. of the same series is contained the metrical chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun, a canon regular of the Priory of St. Andrews, who wrote simultaneously with Fordun, but quite independently, inasmuch as neither was aware of the other's labours.

Just as Dante departed from the usual practice of writers in his day, and, instead of Latin, the only recognised literary medium, used his native Tuscan, so Wyntoun, following the excellent example of Barbour, ventured to compose his poem in the vernacular. Unfortunately, in the same exasperating way in which Barbour excuses himself for not telling the manner in which Sir Andrew de Harcla was captured by Sir John de Soulis, so Wyntoun refrains

\* Edinburgh, 1871-80.

from dwelling on the "gestis" of Wallace and Bruce, because they had been recounted by Barbour and others, and were in everybody's mouth in those days; but, alas! except through Barbour, they have not come down to ours.

Thus of Wallace he says :

" Off his gud dedis and manhad  
Great gestis, I hard say. ar made ;  
Bot sa mony, I trow noucht,  
As he in till hys dayis wroucht.  
Quha all his dedis off prys \* wald dyte †  
Hym worthyd ‡ a gret buk to wryte ;  
And all thai to wryte in here  
I want baith wyt and gud laysere." §

And of Bruce, Wyntoun writes :

" Quhat that efftyr this Brws Robert  
In all hys tyme dyde effterwart,  
The Archedene of Abbyrdene ||  
In Brwys hys Buk has gert \*\* be sene,  
Mare wysly tretyde in to wryt,  
Than I can thynk with all my wyt :  
Tharefore I will now thus lychtly  
Oure at this tyme (passe) the story." ††

Though sharing Wyntoun's appreciation of Barbour's poem of *The Brus*, one would gladly have excused the later writer from the labour of giving the history of the world from the Creation, had he only entered into fuller details regarding public

\* Deeds of merit.

§ Leisure.

† Indite.

|| Barbour.

‡ He would need to.

\*\* Caused.

†† Wyntoun, bk. viii., ch. xviii., 1, 2923.

events in the first quarter of the fourteenth century. However, one cannot be sufficiently grateful to Wyntoun for the prolixity and minuteness with which he has described persons and social conditions of an age so different from our own. He has, moreover, this great merit in common with Barbour, that, unlike some of the English chroniclers, he does full justice to the courage and honest purpose of the enemy, and, though writing as a patriotic Scot, never stoops to vulgar and prejudiced abuse of the other side.

But, most important of all, Barbour, Fordun, and Wyntoun, subject to allowance being made for comparatively trifling discrepancies, for occasional errors in, or transpositions of, dates, and for a few mistakes in names, sustain a tolerably searching application of the cardinal test to which all chroniclers must, sooner or later, be submitted, namely, comparison with official records and documents, of which so many have recently been brought to light.

It is this last circumstance, combined with the production of good and carefully collated editions of the early chronicles, that justifies a fresh attempt to record the "gestis" of Robert the Bruce, to analyse his character and motives, and to weigh the character of his life-work to the Scottish nation. For, besides such allowance as must be made for the simplicity of the three Scottish historians above referred to, who thought it warrant enough for almost any statement that it had been written down by someone else before them, there are the execrable and wilful perversion and suppression of truth by



such later writers as Hector Boece and George Buchanan to be got rid of. Truly did David Laing, in observing that these two only, of all the Latin historians of Scotland, had been translated previously to 1870, remark in addition that "they are the very two who ought to have been consigned to the deepest obscurity."

The fact is, that between Wyntoun in the fourteenth century, and Lord Hailes in the eighteenth, all the history written in Scotland was worse than worthless. Lord Hailes made a splendid redemption, which only required the materials, now at the disposal of everybody, to be complete.

It now remains to be explained what are these materials. Previous to the English Civil War of the seventeenth century, all State papers were jealously guarded, and withheld from public scrutiny. Even historians were not permitted to consult the archives in order to verify their statements. But during the said war, the leaders on either side being anxious to obtain intelligent popular support, fell into the habit of appealing to the people by the publication of correspondence, addresses, and minutes of negotiations. Between the Restoration and the Revolution of 1688, all public treaties entered into by Great Britain were printed by authority. About the same time, various collections of treaties began to be published in France, Germany, and Austria, which were eagerly bought up as fast as they could be produced. Great Britain followed in 1692, when Thomas Rymer, having been appointed Historiographer Royal in succession to Shadwell, was com-

missioned to edit the leagues, treaties, alliances, capitulations, and confederacies of the kingdom. The outcome of this was the celebrated collection known as Rymer's *Fœdera Anglicana*, of which the first volume was published in 1704, the twentieth and last in 1736.

This invaluable fund of authentic information was open to, and greatly made use of by, Lord Hailes in preparing his *Annals*. No Scotsman—no one, indeed, who prizes the dignity of history—can do too great honour to that writer for having dragged the story of his country out of the mire in which it had been suffered to sink, and, for the first time, moulded it into a trustworthy and lucid record. Sir Walter Scott paid him no exaggerated encomium, when, in the introduction to *The Lord of the Isles*, he said, "Lord Hailes was as well entitled to be called the restorer of Scottish history, as Bruce the restorer of Scottish monarchy."

The work begun by Rymer has not slumbered. Parliament has voted money freely to secure the services of the men best fitted to edit those papers which the permanent officials in the various public departments have been indefatigable in repairing, deciphering, and arranging. Hence it has come to pass that an immense amount of fresh material has been placed at the disposal of those who care to make use of it. Much has been brought to light to which Lord Hailes had no access, and, though his work remains unshaken, it has been possible to elucidate certain points on which he was uncertain or misinformed.

In the following narrative it has not been thought desirable to load the pages with references in foot-notes, except, generally, where the authority of such references is cited to refute accepted statements, or confirm doubtful ones in the early historians.\* But great care has been taken to avoid the assertion of circumstances of which, even though they may have found their way into history books, there is no means of verifying. Some of these are notoriously suspect. Take, for example, the well-worn myth of Bruce and the spider. Probably it is the incident in Bruce's career most widely circulated and most popularly believed. The critic who expresses doubts of its veracity will be exposed to the charge of irreverence; if he professes disbelief, to that of rank blasphemy. Yet where is evidence to be found in support of it? Not in the writings of Barbour, Fordun, or Wyntoun, those most nearly contemporary with the Bruce and least likely to suppress a circumstance so picturesque, and illustrating so aptly the perseverance and patience of the national hero under desperate difficulties. No; nothing is heard of this adventure till long after Bruce and his comrades have passed away, and then it makes its appearance, in company with such trash as the miraculous appearance of the arm-bone of St. Fillan on the eve of Bannockburn, and worthy of just about as much consideration.

\* In reference to Rymer's *Fœdera* it will be seen that I have not mentioned the volume or page. The reason is that as there are three or four editions of that great work, each with different pagination, it is easier to turn to quoted passages under the year of the event.

“But then,” it may be argued by persons unwilling to surrender a bit of favourite lore, “how comes it that spiders are treated with peculiar respect in Scotland, and, especially, that no one who claims consanguinity with Bruce will kill, or suffer one to be killed in his presence?”

The answer to that is found in the folk-lore of many other countries. The Jews have a kindly regard for spiders, because it is reported that when David was flying from Saul in the wilderness of Kish, and, closely pressed, took refuge in a cave, a kindly spider straightway spun a web across the mouth, so that when the pursuers came up to it, they judged that no man had entered the cave that day, and they passed on their way. A story, precisely similar, is told of the flight of Mahomet from Mecca. Coming nearer home, we recognise the same venerable fable in Cornwall, where spiders are held sacred because it is believed that one of them wove its web over the infant Saviour, thus concealing him from the search commanded by Herod. Everywhere spiders seemed to have been regarded as “uncanny” in pre-scientific days; and, according to universal human custom, an explanation was devised by connecting the insect with the most prominent national hero. With whose career could it more naturally be connected in Scotland than with that of Bruce, to whom Scotland owed her existence as a nation? There is, in sooth, in his life, plenty of spirit-stirring exploit and heroic confidence amid seemingly hopeless conditions, without borrowing more from the domain of myth. It

may be noticed, by the by, that Hume of Godscroft, composing his history of the Douglasses in the sixteenth century, appropriated the spider incident on behalf of Sir James Douglas, the companion of Bruce. He makes Douglas watch the insect's repeated failures and ultimate success, which he reports to the King with the appropriate moral.





The King of Scotland.



The King of England.

# ROBERT THE BRUCE.

## CHAPTER I.

### THE MAKING OF SCOTLAND.

A.D. 844-1286.

ON July 11, 1274, was born one who was destined to have more lasting influence on the standing of Scotland among the nations, and thereby to mould more powerfully the characters and fortunes of Scotsmen, than any who had gone before, or who should, during the three succeeding centuries, follow him.

Robert de Brus, or Bruce, as the name has come to be written, was eighth in direct male descent from a Norman baron who came to England with William the Conqueror. In the roll of knights who took part in William's expedition, mention is made of *li sires de Breaux e due sens des homes*—the lords of Breaux with two hundred men. It is the only instance in the roll quoted by Leland where the num-

ber of a knight's following is given. These "sires" are believed to have taken their name from the lands of Bruis, Braose, or Breaux (for the name is found in various documents in England, Scotland, and France, spelled in twenty-four different ways), between Cherbourg and Valognes, where the understructure of an ancient castle may still be traced.

The custom of taking territorial designations was almost universal among the Norman chivalry in the days before such titles, or those derived from hereditary office, became crystallised into surnames. But in the family of de Brus, that branch of it, at least, which settled in Scotland, the variation or alternation of baptismal names, whereby different generations were generally distinguished, is almost wholly wanting. One solitary William appears in a long line of Roberts, so that it requires no little care to distinguish between the successive heads of this house.

One of the "sires" who followed the Conqueror seems to have been named William. He became Lord of Brember in Sussex, in which county he had forty-one lordships, besides twelve in Dorsetshire, and others in Wilts, Hants, and Surrey. Another brother bore the name of—

1. Robert de Brus, who received, in princely reward for his services, the grant of ninety-four manors, extending to 40,000 acres, in Yorkshire. He died about 1094.\*

---

\* The author of the *Family Records of the Bruces and the Cumyns* is of opinion that Adelme or Adam, son of Robert de Brus, was in Britain some years before the Conquest, and that, if he was not the first lord of the Yorkshire lands, he succeeded to them, and was

2. Robert de Brus, son of No. 1, married Agnes, daughter of Fulk Pagnel of Carlton. He became a friend of David I. of Scotland at the Court of Henry I. of England, and subsequently received from David a grant of Annandale, extending from the borders of Dunegal, Celtic chief of Nithsdale, to those of the Earl of Cumberland.\* Before the battle of the Standard, 1138, he renounced his Scottish fief of Annandale, perhaps in favor of his son, and, having vainly tried to dissuade King David from fighting, joined the forces of King Stephen. He died in 1141.

3. Robert de Brus, second Lord of Annandale, was the second son of No. 2, whence he was known as le Meschin, the cadet, or stripling. If he did not, as the story goes, receive Annandale for refusing to desert David's cause at the battle of the Standard, the lordship must have been subsequently restored to him in the confirmation granted by William the Lion in 1166, wherein the fee is fixed at the service of a hundred knights. His chief house was Lochmaben. His elder brother, Adam, succeeded to his father's lands in Yorkshire, and from this point the English and Scottish houses of de Brus diverge, though le Meschin remained an English baron as well as a Scottish one, for his father made over to him the manor of Hert in the bishopric of Durham. He

probably the first lord of Annandale. This Adelme, if he ever existed, must have been father of David's friend, Robert de Brus, Lord of Annandale. But, as usual in the work referred to, no reference is given to any authority for this view.

\* *Charter*, c. 1124.



died about 1189-90. His elder brother Adelme, Lord of Skelton and owner of the lands in Yorkshire and elsewhere, became head of the English branch, which came to an end in the persons of four co-heiresses in 1271.

4. Robert de Brus, third Lord of Annandale, if indeed he survived his father le Meschin, married the Princess Isabel, daughter of William the Lion, and must have died about 1190, for his widow married Robert de Ros in 1191. He acquired with his wife the barony of Haltwhistle in Northumberland.

5. William de Brus, fourth Lord of Annandale, second son of le Meschin, died in 1215.

6. Robert de Brus, fifth Lord of Annandale, son of William, the fourth lord, married Isabel, second daughter of David, Earl of Huntingdon, younger brother of William the Lion, whence arose the subsequent claim of his son to the Crown of Scotland. He died in 1245.

7. Robert de Brus, sixth Lord of Annandale, "the Competitor," son of the fifth lord and grand-nephew of William the Lion, married Isabel de Clare, daughter of the Earl of Gloucester. In 1238, Alexander II. acknowledged this lord as his heir, an act ratified by the Great Council, and followed by the performance of fealty to de Brus by the barons present, but the birth of Alexander III. in 1241 extinguished his claim to the throne. He acquiesced in King Edward's award in the disputed succession in 1292, and, being stricken in years, resigned all his rights in favour of his son, the Earl of Carrick. He died in 1295.

8. Robert de Brus, seventh Lord of Annandale, and, in right of his wife, Earl of Carrick, was the eldest son of the sixth lord. He married Marjorie, daughter and heiress of Nigel or Niall, Celtic Earl of Carrick, the grandson of Gilbert, son of Fergus, Lord of Galloway. This lady was also the widow of Adam of Kilconquhar. She is said to have met de Brus returning from hunting; to have fallen in love with him straightway, and carried him off to her castle of Turnberry, where, after fifteen days' dalliance, she married him. It has been suspected that this was a ruse, for Dame Marjorie was a royal ward, and de Brus committed a grave offence in marrying her without the King's leave; an offence, however, which could not be visited very seriously if the lady could be supposed to have taken the law into her own hands. De Brus took King Edward's side against Balliol in 1296, in revenge for which Balliol seized Annandale and placed John Comyn in the lordship. De Brus was King Edward's governor of Carlisle from 1295 till 1297, and died in 1304.

9. Robert de Brus, eighth Lord of Annandale and Earl of Carrick, was the eldest son of the seventh lord and Countess Marjorie. He married first, Isabel de Mar second, Elizabeth de Burgh, daughter of the Earl of Ulster, and became King of Scotland.

Three things have to be borne in mind in tracing the course of the Scottish struggle for independence, and in analysing the conflicting causes which swayed those who took part in it. First, the comparatively recent consolidation of Scotland

from four kingdoms into one, and the existence within the realm of four distinct races, perhaps nearly equal in numbers; namely, the Picts, the Scottish Gael, the Teuton or Anglian, and the Scandinavian. Second, the close relationship between the royal houses of England and Scotland. Third, the extent to which the lands of the native chiefs and septs had passed into the hands of Norman barons, most of whom, besides doing homage to the King of Scots for estates held from him, also owed allegiance to the King of England for lands in his dominions, not less valuable and extensive than their Scottish possessions, and which had generally been much longer in their families. This double allegiance will be found to account for a great deal of inconsistency and vacillation shown by some of the most puissant barons of that age.

The kingdom of Scotland, so far as it could be said to exist at the time of the Norman conquest of England, was of very recent origin and of constantly fluctuating dimensions. It is true that in the earlier half of the ninth century, Kenneth MacAlpin, King of the Scots of Dalriada, overcame the Picts by the help of the Danes, and, in 844, became the first monarch over all Alban, or, as it subsequently came to be called, Scotia. But this kingdom of Scone included no more than central Scotland, Perthshire, Argyll, Angus and Mearns, and Fife. The ancient territory of the northern Picts, extending over a great part of what we now call the Highlands, was partly under independent Celtic chiefs and partly held by Norsemen. Galloway and half Ayrshire

were alternately under Pictish, Norse, and Saxon (Northumbrian) rule ; while Lothian, though nominally part of the realm of Northumbria, was really the prey of rival Saxon chiefs. The Norse jarls of Orkney maintained independent sway in Caithness and the Sudreys or Western Isles, and in parts of Galloway, till after the death of Earl Sigurd at the battle of Clontarf near Dublin, in 1014. Even then the Scottish realm could not be reckoned as extending south of the Forth or north of the Spey.

But in 1054 an important advance was made towards consolidation. Malcolm Canmore, son of Duncan slain by Macbeth, was then rightful King of Scotia. His uncle, Siward, Danish Earl of Northumbria, espoused his cause against the usurper Macbeth, and invaded Scotia. Failing in his intention to dethrone Macbeth, who was supported by Thorfinn, Earl of Orkney, he succeeded in wresting from him Cumbria and the Lothians, and established Malcolm as King of Cumbria. Three years later, Malcolm attacked Macbeth, drove him across the Mounth, and slew him at Lumphannan, August 15, 1057.

This was probably the year of powerful Earl Thorfinn's death and the consequent severance of the nine earldoms held in subjection by him. It was then, only three years before the Norman conquest of England, that Scotland first presented the semblance of an united and independent kingdom, though even at that time the Celtic, Saxon, and Norse elements in the population were too distinct, and too sharply defined in locality, to offer much

prospect of permanent union into a homogeneous nationality.

King Malcolm diplomatically endeavoured to conciliate his Norse subjects by marrying Ingibiorg, widow of his ancient enemy Thorfinn, and by her he had a son, Duncan. She must have died before 1067, for in that year Child Eadgar, son of Eadward Aetheling, flying with his mother and sisters before the Normans, sought refuge in the Scottish Court. Malcolm, having by his first marriage put the Norsemen in good humour, now flattered the Anglo-Saxons of his realm by taking as his second consort the Princess Margaret, sister of Eadgar Aetheling. This involved him in prolonged hostilities with King William, for Malcolm championed the cause of his brother-in-law, whom the northern English regarded as their rightful king. From this point may be traced the original cause of subsequent long centuries of war between England and Scotland; for King William, having invaded Scotland, forced Malcolm to become his man, taking his son Duncan as hostage and granting Malcolm lands in England as further security for good faith.

In 1091 a reconciliation was effected between William Rufus, Malcolm, and Eadgar Aetheling; Malcolm doing fresh homage for his English possessions, which, according to some writers, consisted only of lands in the south; according to others, also included Lothian. But the good understanding did not last long. Malcolm having reopened hostilities was defeated and slain near Alnwick in 1093, and with

him fell his son and heir Eadward. The ancient British kingdom of Cumbria was severed in twain, the northern half, from Solway to Clyde remaining part of Scotland, the southern half becoming permanently annexed to the realm of England. Thus the frontier between England and Scotland was drawn along very nearly the same line it occupies at this day, though, as will be shown hereafter, it has often been violently disturbed. Caithness and Orkney were still Norse territory, and over the Western Isles and Galloway the Scottish monarch exercised no more than a nominal, or at least intermittent, rule.

But Malcolm's newly knit kingdom was to lose after his death even the semblance of unity which he had conferred on it. Donald Ban, Malcolm's brother, reigned for six months, to be dispossessed by Duncan, Malcolm's eldest son by Queen Ingi-biorg, who also reigned six months. Duncan was slain in the Mearns by the forces of his half-brother Eadmund, and his uncle, Donald Ban, who then shared the throne between them, and reigned for three years, 1094-97. They were in turn deposed by Eadgar Aetheling in favour of another of Malcolm Canmore's sons, Eadgar, who reigned over the kingdom of Scotland, under the limitations above described, for nine years, 1097-1107. Donald and Eadward were both imprisoned for life, the former, for his better security, being deprived of sight. Dying in 1107, Eadgar bequeathed to his brother Alexander the ancient and independent kingdom of Alban or Scotia proper, while to his younger brother David he left Lothian and all that remained Scot-

tish of Cumbria, namely, the counties of Dumfries, Lanark, north Ayrshire, Renfrew, and Dunbarton. Thus by his own act the King of Scots deliberately divided the kingdom which it had cost so much hard fighting to put together. This partition of the realm endured till the death of Alexander the Fierce \* in 1124.

David was now the only surviving son of Malcolm Canmore. His sister Matilda had become Queen of England in 1100 by her marriage with Henry I., and David had spent much of his youth at her Court, a circumstance that was to have much influence on the current of events in the northern kingdom. For it was there that young David became acquainted with Norman civilisation, and easily acquired the idea of feudal rule, which presented itself to him with all the glamour of chivalry. His brother-in-law, King Henry, bestowed on him in marriage Matilda, daughter of Waltheof, Earl of Northumberland, and widow of Simon, Earl of Northampton. The latter earldom, with the honour of Huntingdon, David enjoyed during his wife's life. Now an earldom in Norman days was not the barren honour it has become in modern times. It carried with it feudal power and almost absolute jurisdiction over the manors attached to it, besides such revenues as they might produce. Consequently, David was as much a Norman baron in fact, as he had already become in sympathy. He did homage to King

\* "Hys legys all

Oysid hym Alysandyr the Fers to call."

Wyntoun, bk. vii., c. 5.

Henry for his English earldom if not for his dominion of Lothian. When he left the English Court in 1124 to set up his own Court as King of Lothian and Strathclyde, he brought with him many young Norman knights, his friends, among whom came, as has been shown, Robert de Brus, on whom the lordship of Annandale had been bestowed. This well-known name is appended to the foundation charter granted by David in 1113 to the monastery of Selkirk. It is one of twenty-eight signatures, of which no fewer than eleven are those of Norman witnesses, amid nine Saxon, one Celtic, and those of the Bishop of Glasgow, three chaplains, and Queen Matilda, besides King David's son Henry, and his nephew William.

When Alexander the Fierce died in 1124, David's government of southern Scotland had been entirely remodelled on the feudal pattern; the greater part of the soil was held in fief by Norman barons, and as much as possible had been done to make the people forget that there was any real difference between them and the subjects of King Henry.

As soon as David succeeded his brother Alexander on the throne of Scotland proper, he set on foot similar reforms there also. The ancient constitution of the Seven Earls was superseded, as the tenour of David's charters proves, to make place for a feudal scheme of "bishops, abbots, earls, sheriffs, barons, governors, and officers, and all the good men of the whole land, Norman, English, and Scots." He still did fealty to Henry for his territory in Lothian, but north of the Firths David was absolute monarch of



all except Caithness and the Isles. Many, if not most of his barons, owed homage to the English king for their lands south of the Border.

If this want of solidarity in the monarchy and government delayed, as it must have done, the birth of a national spirit and the expansion of the narrow bonds of sept into intelligent patriotism, much more must the piebald ethnology of David's dominion have stood in the way. Considerable fusion, no doubt, had already taken place, in certain districts, between Celtic, Saxon, and Norse people. Members of the same family sometimes bore, one a Gaelic, another a Saxon name.\* But the four separate kingdoms of ancient Alban of the eighth century were still peopled by widely different races. The Scots of Argyll and the Isles had become pretty well fused with the Picts of the Highlands; but they had looked upon the Welshmen of Strathclyde, not as brother Celts, but as hereditary foes, ever since the Roman occupation. The Saxon population of Lothian, Tweeddale and Strathannan were equally severed from the Highlands by the barrier of different speech. Even at the present day may be traced some of the ancient contempt of the Gael for the Saisneach or Saxon, a feeling which, in the reign of David I., had been tempered by none of the enlightening influence of education. As for the people of Caithness and the Isles, it must have seemed an idle

\* It is recorded in 1166 how Richard de Morville, Constable of Scotland, sold Edmund, the son of Bonda, and Gillemichel, his brother, to Henry St. Clair. Here Edmund and Bonda are Saxon names, but Gillemichel is Gaelic.

dream to unite them with the races with which they had for centuries been at cruel enmity ; and the men of Galloway, though originally of Celtic race, had been so long under Norse influence, and were so largely infused with Norse blood, that they had become known among other Celts as *Gall Gaidheal*, foreign Gaels ; Gaels, that is, but foreigners, much as Englishmen now look on Americans.\* The formidable insurrection of 1130, under Malcolm and Angus, the sons of Heth and grandsons of Lulach, the Mormaer of Moray, was a revolt of the Gael against the Saisneach, for Saxon and Norman were merged in the common term applied to the hated Southerner. Of like nature was the rising under the impostor Wilmund between 1141 and 1150, when many Celtic chiefs joined in an attempt to throw off the Norman yoke which the policy of David had laid upon the land.

However, when David invaded England in 1138 to support his niece, Matilda, in her conflict with Stephen, his army, as Ailred of Rievauld affirms, was composed, not only of men under his own rule, but of those under Norse dominion also.

This expedition placed several of David's Norman barons in a dilemma ; for, if they refused to follow the King of Scots, their Scottish lands and dignities would be in jeopardy ; whereas if they marched with David, and yet failed to overthrow Stephen, they would be sure to forfeit their English possessions.

Upon none of them did this weigh more heavily

---

\* The modern name Galloway is an altered form of *Gall-gaidheal*, through the Welsh *Gall-wyddel*.

than on Robert de Brus, the friend of David's youth, who, it is said, made himself the mouthpiece of his peers, and sought audience with the King in his camp on the Tees, in order to remonstrate with him. Ailred gives a speech at length which he was supposed to have delivered to David, of which one sentence is worth quoting, as illustrating the precarious nature of Scottish nationality in those early days.

"Against whom," says Bruce, "dost thou this day take up arms and lead this countless host? Is it not against the English and Normans? O King, are they not those from whom thou hast always obtained profitable counsel and prompt assistance? When, I ask thee, hast thou ever found such fidelity in the Scots, that thou canst confidently dispense with the advice of the English and the assistance of the Normans, as if the Scots sufficed thee even against the Scots?"

It is said that the King's love for de Brus inclined him to yield to his persuasion, but that William, David's nephew, overruled him, and he remained inflexible, whereupon de Brus and Bernard de Balliol renounced their allegiance to the King of Scots. De Brus resigned his lordship of Annandale in favour of his second son, a boy of fourteen, and went over to Stephen's camp, leaving the lad in command of the men of Annandale. Tradition, a dubious guide, goes on to say that in the battle of the Standard which followed, de Brus took his own son prisoner, and that when he brought the stripling before the victorious Stephen and asked how he wished him

disposed of (for he could not hold his own son to ransom), the English King, laughing, said, "Take him to his nurse!"

Notwithstanding his defeat, David not only retained the earldom of Huntingdon, but stipulated that his son Henry should hold the earldom of Northumberland under Stephen. Thus the King of Scots and his sons were both vassals of the Crown of England. On the other hand, Stephen, then at civil war with Queen Matilda, was not strong enough to deprive David of Cumberland and Carlisle, which had again become part of the Scottish kingdom.

King David I. died in 1153. His successor, Malcolm IV., surrendered both Northumberland and Cumberland to Henry II., but indemnified himself by the subjugation of Moray, where the Celtic population had become much intermixed with a numerous settlement of Flemings. The old Picto-Norse province of Galloway, too, comprising the modern counties of Wigtown and Kirkcudbright, with south Ayrshire, was now brought into final subjection. For, when King Malcolm went to fight the battles of Henry II. in France, which, as his liegeman for Lothian and his English estates, he was bound to do, he was summoned back in haste, and returned to find his kingdom in confusion. The Galwegians were in open revolt under their hereditary lord, Fergus, endeavouring to place William, great-grandson of their lady Ingibiorg on the throne of Scotland. Twice Malcolm's expeditions were repelled, but the third time success crowned his arms, and Galloway was finally brought into the realm, though

the disaffection of its people continued, for more than a century, to be a source of insecurity to the unity of Scotland.

Scottish statesmen still held that Northumberland and Cumberland were rightfully part of their kingdom. It was in faith of a promise that these earldoms should be restored to him that William the Lion, King of Scots, fought in the army of Henry II. against France, as his vassal for the earldom of Huntingdon; and it was because of the failure of Henry to fulfil this promise that King William took the first step in the long alliance between Scotland and France, by making overtures to Louis VII. William the Lion was taken prisoner at Alnwick in 1174, and, in order to obtain his release, consented to a condition which gave fresh ground for the controversy about the suzerainty of the Kings of England over Scotland. He bound himself to do homage for his own kingdom to the English monarch. Fifteen years later, Richard Cœur de Lion, being in straits for ready money, remitted this humiliating obligation for a payment of ten thousand marks.

In view of the subsequent course of events, it is of moment to remember the terms of King Richard's resignation :

"We have rendered up to William, by the grace of God King of Scots, his castles of Roxburgh and Berwick, to be possessed by him and his heirs for ever as their own proper inheritance.

"Moreover, we have granted to him an acquittance of all obligations which our good father, Henry King of England, extorted (*extorsit*) from him by new instruments in consequence of his captivity; under this condition only, that he shall completely and fully

perform to us whatever his brother Malcolm, King of Scotland, of right performed, or ought of right to have performed, to our predecessors." \*

King Richard, by the same instrument, re-established the Marches of the two kingdoms as they had been before William's captivity. He also delivered up such of the evidences of the homage done to King Henry II. by the Scottish clergy and barons as were in his possession, and declared that all such evidences, whether delivered up or not, should be held as cancelled.† Nothing could be more complete, or intended to be more complete, than the restoration of her independence to Scotland as she then was.

It was not, however, until the reign of Alexander III. that the Scottish kingdom as we know it, with the exception of Orkney and Shetland and the addition of the Isle of Man, was completed by the overthrow, in 1263, of Haco, King of Norway, at the battle of Largs. The Western Isles were then first made subject to the Scottish Crown.

Thus it will be observed that, towards the close of the thirteenth century, the kingdom of Scotland was a territory very different from any that had borne that name in the past. Newborn Scotland had at last become something more than what Metternich once called Italy—"a geographical expression."

But it was not only by extending the bounds of his dominion that this wise and strong monarch succeeded in welding into one nation the different and

\* *Fædera*.

† Hailes, i., 155.

hostile races inhabiting it. It was by indefatigable attention to the affairs of government—by cultivating friendly relations with stronger powers, and especially with England—by incessant personal visitation of all parts of his realm—that he led his people to look to the throne as the fountain of power and protection. The degree to which the ruling class had become alien—Norman—was shown at the coronation of Alexander III. in 1249, when the coronation oath was first read in Latin, and then expounded in Norman-French.\* But by his attention to the development of commerce and native industry, he taught the industrial and commercial classes that the government was something more than a contrivance for collecting taxes or for exacting onerous military service. Thus he prepared the only soil in which the plant of patriotism will ever take root and flourish. Men will never be got to make sacrifices for that which it is not their private interest to preserve and defend. Wallace and Bruce would have toiled in vain, but for the sentiment of common nationality which King Alexander called into being.

But the Scottish King's ardour for Scottish nationality betrayed him into no jealousy of, or rivalry with his powerful neighbour. On the contrary, throughout his long reign he sought and maintained friendly relations, first with Henry III. and then with Edward I. On December 26, 1251, King Alexander married Princess Margaret, daughter of

\* Hailes, i., 195.

Henry III., thus adding one more to the many bonds of consanguinity which united the royal houses of England and Scotland.

Alexander was only ten years of age at the time of this marriage, and King Henry thought it a good opportunity to renew the defunct claim to the homage of Scotland, "according to the usage recorded in many chronicles." But King Alexander, acting under advice of his ministers, wisely made answer that "he had been invited to York to marry the Princess of England, not to treat of affairs of State, and that he could not take such an important step without the knowledge and approbation of his Parliament."

The claim of the English Kings to the homage of Scotland was renewed from time to time, completely ignoring the renunciation by Richard Cœur de Lion. Henry III. died in 1272. In 1278 King Alexander did homage to Edward I. in general terms, and by proxy. Robert de Brus, afterwards to become famous as "the Competitor," performed the ceremony in place of the King of Scots, using the formula—"for the services due on account of the lands and tenements which I hold of the King of England." King Edward accepted it, though certain discrepancies in the record, which contains a clause "saving the claim of homage for the kingdom of Scotland whenever that question might be raised," have caused grave doubts as to its authenticity.\*

King Alexander's first Queen, Margaret of Eng-

\* Robertson's *Scotland under her Early Kings*, ii., p. 425.



land, died in 1275. Ten years later, he married Joleta, daughter of the Count de Dreux.

On March 16, 1286, the King held a dinner-party in Edinburgh, though it was the season of Lent. After dinner he set out, accompanied by three knights, in a terrible tempest, to visit his young Queen, then residing at Kinghorn in Fife. At Queensferry the boatman tried to dissuade the King from attempting the passage on such an awful night ; but he good-humouredly asked the man if he was afraid to face death in such good company. "Not I, sire," quoth the boatman, "it would well become me to perish with your father's son!" The crossing was effected in safety, and the party landed in the dark at Inverkeithing. Here the master of the King's saltworks pressed him not to persevere through the storm, but to deign to accept a bed in his house and proceed in daylight. The King, laughing, refused his hospitality, but asked for a couple of guides on foot ; for the road probably was a mere bridle-path through woods and moors. They had not gone above two miles before they lost the track ; and in trying to regain it, the King fell from his horse and was killed.\* He died in the forty-fifth year of his life and the thirty-seventh of his reign.


There were not wanting superstitious critics who viewed his death as a judgment for feasting and visiting his wife in Lent ; but Fordun, with loftier view, pronounced this noble elegy on the dead mon-

\* *Lanercost*, 115.

arch: "Let no man question the salvation of this King. He who has lived well, cannot die ill."

No greater calamity could have befallen the young kingdom of Scotland than the unforeseen end of this beneficent ruler. Henceforward the resources of the country were to be sapped by perpetual warfare, civil and foreign; the wealth accumulated under the prosperous reigns of Alexander and his predecessors was to be dissipated, and all productive industry brought to a standstill, until the very name of Scot should become a synonym for pauper in the languages of Europe.





Sir John de Balliol.



Sir Robert de Brus.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE DISPUTED SUCCESSION.

A.D. 1286-1291.

THE gravity of the crisis in Scottish affairs lay in the fact that Alexander III. had died childless. Two sons had predeceased him, and one daughter, Princess Margaret, who had married Eric, King of Norway. She left a daughter, also called Margaret, upon whom, on February 5, 1284, the succession to the throne of Scotland had been settled by the Parliament of Scone, "failing any children whom Alexander might have, and failing the issue of the Prince of Scotland." \*

Princess Margaret, or the Maid of Norway, as she is known in the mournful annals of these years, being an infant at her father's Court, a Regency was appointed immediately after the King's death, consisting of six Guardians of the realm. These were

---

\* King Alexander's eldest son by Queen Margaret, Prince Alexander, married Margaret, daughter of Guy, Earl of Flanders, in 1282, and died in January, 1284.

William Fraser, Bishop of St. Andrews, Duncan, Earl of Fife, and Alexander, Earl of Buchan, having authority over the dominions north of the Firths; and Robert Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow, John Comyn, Lord of Badenoch, and James the Steward, for the country south of the Firths. Lord Hailes affirms that this was done by general consent, and is severe in comment upon the historian Buchanan for having said "affectedly and erroneously" that the business of the assembly at Scone was the question of creating a new King, whereas that had been already settled by the acknowledgment in 1284 of the Maid of Norway as presumptive heir to the throne. But in truth there is now good reason to doubt the unanimity of the consent to that settlement. King Alexander was only forty-four when it was made. The probability of his dying shortly, or without more issue, was remote. Assent was given to the settlement, no doubt, but nobody could foresee how soon it was to take effect, and some who might have objected probably did not think it worth while, seeing that the King was just about to take a second wife. Be that as it may, the fact has now come to light that, twelve days after King Alexander's death, the Bishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, and the magnates of Scotland addressed a letter to Edward I., asking his advice as the nearest relative of their infant Queen. Sir Francis Palgrave was the first to point out that civil war undoubtedly did break out in Scotland immediately after Alexander's death, and that it was caused by Robert de Brus, Lord of Annandale, advancing his

claim to the throne. Barbour, Fordun, and other chroniclers are all significantly silent on this head, but they did not write till long after the Brucian settlement, and it is only too much in accord with the practice of historians of every age, and especially of the Middle Ages, to suppress everything that might tell to the discredit of the reigning house. It is strange, however, that John de Balliol's averment, in pleading his claim to the Crown before King Edward, has received so little attention from later historians. He there alleged that—

“ When the bishops and great men of Scotland had sworn to defend the kingdom for their Lady, the daughter of the King of Norway, . . . Sir Robert de Brus and the Earl of Carrick, his son, attacked the castle of Dumfries with fire and arms and banners displayed, and against the peace expelled the forces of the Queen who held the same. Hence Sir Robert advanced to the castle of Botil.\* He then caused a proclamation to be made by one Patrick M'Guffok within the bailary of the said castle. . . Furthermore, the Earl of Carrick, by the assent and power of his father, took the Lady of Scotland's castle of Wigtown, and killed several people there.” †

Several passages may be quoted from the Records to prove that this allegation was strictly in accord with what had taken place. Sir William de St. Clair, Sheriff (*vicecomes*) of Dumfries, reported to the Chancellor that the lands of Bardonan in Galloway, a royal ward, had lain uncultivated for two years, because of the war ensuing on King Alexander's death.‡ A similar report was made of the Crown lands in Wigtownshire by the sheriff of that county,

\* Now called Buittle ; de Balliol's residence in Galloway.

† Palgrave, p. lxxx.

‡ *Exchequer Rolls*, i., 35.

John Comyn, Earl of Buchan, with the further note that the war was raised by the Earl of Carrick.\* Again, the breaking out of war is given as the reason for increased expenditure on the castles of Dumfries, Edinburgh, Jedburgh, and Ayr, in the year 1286.† There can be no doubt that an attempt was made at this time to seize the kingdom for Robert de Brus, whom Alexander II. had designated as his heir in 1238. On September 20, 1286, certain nobles—Patrick, Earl of March, and his three sons, Walter Comyn, Earl of Menteith, and his two sons, Robert de Brus, Lord of Annandale, and his two sons (Robert, Earl of Carrick, and Richard), James the Steward and his brother Sir John of Bonkil, Angus Macdonald and his son—assembled at Turnberry and entered upon a bond of mutual defence, in order to secure the royal succession according to the ancient customs hitherto observed in Scotland.‡ There was not the slightest reference in this treaty (which is still in existence) to the child-queen Margaret, no doubt because the "ancient customs" did not permit of a female sovereign.

It must be left matter for speculation how the civil war was brought to a close. We have to resume the course of events in 1288, when the number of Guardians was reduced from six to four, by the assassination of the Earl of Fife by Sir Patrick Abercrombie and Sir Walter de Percy, and the death of the Earl of Buchan about the same time. Meanwhile, the far-sighted sagacity of King Edward had

\* *Exchequer Rolls*, i., 39.

† *Ibid.*, 37, 38, 42, 44.

‡ Stevenson, i., 22.

conceived the statesmanlike project of bringing about the union of England and Scotland under one Crown, and thus laying to perpetual rest the thorny question of the suzerainty, by marrying his son and heir to the young Queen of Scots. With this end in view, he entered into negotiations with King Eric of Norway, who owed him a large sum of money, and was by so much the more disposed to listen to Edward's proposals. The four Guardians of Scotland disagreed among themselves, probably on the question of the projected marriage, which, if carried into effect, would, of course, put an end to the cherished schemes of the parties of de Brus and de Balliol. King Eric sent plenipotentiaries in 1289 to treat with the King of England, who appointed the Bishops of Durham and Winchester and the Earls of Pembroke and Warrene to meet them. A conference took place at Salisbury on November 6th, at which the Scottish nation was represented by the Bishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, Comyn, Lord of Badenoch (being three out of the four Guardians), and Robert de Brus, Lord of Annandale, who had composed their differences for the occasion. Here it was agreed on the part of the Norwegians that Queen Margaret should be conveyed immediately, either to her own realm of Scotland, or to England, but free from all matrimonial engagement. On the part of the English it was agreed that, if King Edward received Margaret from her father, he should deliver her free to the Scottish people, provided law and order were restored in that country (*quant le réaume de Escosse serra bien assésuré et en*

*bon pees, issi ke ele i puisse seurement venir et demorer.)\** A further clause provided that the Scots should bind themselves under security to the King of England not to bestow their Queen in marriage, except by his ordinance, will, and advice, and with the consent of King Eric, her father. Lastly, the Scots bound themselves to restore order in Scotland before the arrival of the Queen; to give security for her safety and freedom; to remove any of the Guardians or ministers of Scotland to whom the King of Norway should take exception, and to replace them by others chosen by the good men of Norway and Scotland. In the event of disagreement, King Edward was to appoint commissioners to decide between them.

Now it will be seen that this treaty placed the matter pretty completely in the power of King Edward, nor, perhaps, could it at that time have fallen into better hands. He was honestly anxious to bring about the best conclusion for the welfare of the two kingdoms. By the last-mentioned article it was put in his power to effect the removal of any of the Guardians likely to prove troublesome, for the King of Norway was so heavily in his debt that he would be ready to object to any who were objectionable to Edward. On this point Lord Hailes has remarked that, as three of the four Scottish signatories to this convention were Guardians of Scotland, this proviso was designed for the expulsion of the fourth Guardian, James the Steward. But Lord

---

\* *Fædera.*



Hailes was writing in ignorance of the war which had been raised by the party of de Brus, of which James had been an active member, as his presence at Turnberry and his assent to the league had proved. The intention of this provision seems to have been generally to prevent any one of the Guardians using his official power to further schemes contrary to the interests of the Prince of England, as consort of the Queen of Scotland.

Still, nothing was expressed in this treaty about the betrothal of the Prince and the Queen. Edward, however, had already sent an embassy to Pope Nicholas IV., craving the necessary dispensation. This was granted on November 16th, and the news was allowed to leak out that it had been obtained. As soon as it reached Scotland, the four Guardians, forty-four ecclesiastics, twelve earls (including the Earl of Carrick), and forty-seven barons, signed a letter to King Edward, expressing a hope that the rumour was true, and offering their hearty consent to the alliance. On March 17th they addressed a letter to King Eric, praying him to send his daughter to be married to Prince Edward of England. A month later King Edward wrote to King Eric, informing him that he had obtained the Papal dispensation, and requesting him to send Queen Margaret to him in England. On July 18, 1290, a memorable treaty was concluded at Birgham on the Tweed, defining the relations between England and Scotland in the event of the marriage taking place.

It was agreed, among other things, between the English and Scottish commissioners :

“ That the rights, laws, liberties, and customs of Scotland should remain for ever entire and inviolable . . . that the kingdom of Scotland should remain separate and divided from England, free in itself and *without subjection*, according to its right boundaries and marches as heretofore, saving always the right of the King of England, and of all other (rights) which before the date of this treaty belonged to him, or any of them, in the marches or elsewhere, *or which may justly belong to him, or any of them, in all time coming.*”\*

Of course, the two phrases printed in italics were utterly irreconcilable with each other, as was to appear hereafter.

Next, on August 28th, Edward appointed Anthony Beck, Bishop of Durham, as his lieutenant in Scotland “ to act in concert with the Guardians, and by the advice of the prelates and nobles of the realm.” Edward further demanded that all the fortresses of Scotland should be given up to him “ because of certain perils and suspicions of which he had heard.”† This the Scottish commissioners refused to do, but they undertook to hand the castles over to the Queen and her intended consort as their joint sovereigns.‡

The fair project for the union of the two kingdoms was suddenly shattered by a calamity, of which it is impossible to write without chagrin, even after the lapse of six hundred years.

King Edward directed a large ship to be fitted

\* *Fœdera.*

† *Ibid.* *Purs aucuns perils e suspecons que il avoyt entendu.* These perils and suspicions were, no doubt, the attempt by de Brus's party, and probably that of de Balliol also, to revert to the ancient customs of Scotland, and set aside the succession of a female.

‡ *Ibid.*

service, apply a speedy remedy. My lords the Bishop of Durham, Earl Warenne, and I, heard afterwards that our foresaid Lady recovered of her sickness, but she is still weak ; and therefore we have agreed among ourselves to remain about Perth, until we have certain news by the knights who are sent to Orkney what is the condition of our Lady—would that it may be prosperous and happy !—and if we shall have the accounts which we wish about her, and which we expect from day to day, we will be ready to set forth for carrying out the business committed to us to the best of our power. If Sir John de Balliol comes to your presence, we advise you to take care so to treat with him that in any event your honour and advantage be preserved. If it turn out that our Lady has departed this life—and may it not be so !—let your excellency deign if you please to approach towards the March for the consolation of the Scottish people, and the saving of the shedding of blood, so that the faithful men of the kingdom may keep their oath inviolate, and set over them for King him who of right ought to have the succession, if so be that he will follow your counsel. May your Excellency have long life, health and prosperity, and happiness.

“ Given at Leuchars on the Saturday, the morrow of St. Faith the Virgin, in the year of our Lord 1290.” \*

There will be occasion to refer to certain passages in the bishop's letter hereafter. Meanwhile, it may be remarked that it is the only known contemporary document in which allusion is made to an event of such enormous political importance as the death of the Queen of Scots. Still more strange is it that Barbour makes not the slightest reference to the Maid of Norway's death, although it was the circumstance from which arose directly the events he undertook to record. He only says :

“ Quhen Alysandyre the King was dede,  
That Scotland had to ster and lede,  
The Land sex yhere and mayr perfay,  
Lay desolate eftyr his day.”

---

\* *National MSS. of Scotland*, vol. i., No. 70.

Fordun says the Queen died in 1291, and Wyntoun gives a wholly apocryphal account, how that Sir David of the Wemys and Michael Scot of Balwearie went to Norway to receive the Maiden, to conduct her to Scotland, and that on their arrival there they found that she had been put to death. In spite of Bishop Fraser referring to it as merely a rumour, it has been surmised that this was his diplomatic way of alluding to a circumstance already known to have taken place. There was wide-spread suspicion of foul play. It was known to be against the interests of more than one powerful individual in Scotland that Margaret should be crowned. The story that she had been kidnapped was almost universally believed in Norway, and obtained such currency elsewhere that when, ten years later, in 1300, a German woman, a native of Lubeck, gave out that she was Margaret Queen of Scotland, and was burnt as an impostor at Nordness in 1309, a church was erected on the site of her execution, in memory of the "martyred Maritte," as people called her. It continued for long to be a favourite place of pilgrimage, in spite of many edicts forbidding all persons to resort thither.

But there can be no reasonable doubt that Queen Margaret did die in Orkney, in the presence of Bishop Narve of Bergen, who took her remains back to Norway, where they were inspected and identified by her father.

With the Maid of Norway's life the line of Alexander was extinguished, and no provision had been made for the succession beyond his descendants.

There was no scarcity of claimants to the throne. Fordun's account of what ensued during the winter of 1290-91 is probably near the truth :

“ The nobles of the kingdom, with its Guardians, oftentimes discussed among themselves the question who should be made their king ; but they did not make bold to utter what they felt about the right of succession, partly because it was a hard and knotty matter ; partly because different people felt differently about those rights, and wavered a good deal ; partly because they justly feared the power of the parties, which was great, and partly because they had no superior who could, by his unbending power, carry their award into execution or make parties abide by their decision.”

In short, the military and political weight of the chief claimants was so nearly balanced that any decision which might have been made would have been the signal for civil war. Matters had arrived at an *impasse*, and any attempt to solve it would have caused a conflagration. Under these circumstances, it is fair to enquire whether Bishop Fraser has merited the obloquy which has been heaped on his memory because of his letter to King Edward.

It has been mentioned above that dissensions had arisen early among the four surviving Guardians of the realm. The supreme authority seems to have passed into the hands of two of them, the Bishop of St. Andrews acting for the north, and John Comyn acting for the south. On the death of the Maid of Norway, the policy of the faction which these two Guardians represented was to elevate John de Balliol to the throne, on the understanding that the suzerainty of England should be acknowledged. The Bishop's allusion in his letter to “ the faithful men

of the kingdom keeping their oath inviolate" has always been interpreted to imply submission to the claims of England, though it is possible to understand therein a reference to the allegiance due to the legitimate successor of Queen Margaret, implied in the oath of his subjects to King Alexander. Even the temperate Hailes talks of Bishop Fraser's "dark and dangerous policy" and his "base proposal." The fact is that what Scotland stood in supreme need of at this juncture, was some strong and, if possible, disinterested power, to protect her from the violence of her own barons. Fraser was desperately anxious to save his country from the misery of civil war, and he took the course which offered the most hopeful means of doing so, by communicating with that monarch who had been for years, and was at that moment, in the closest and most friendly diplomatic relations with the Government of Scotland. The sole passage in this celebrated letter which lends itself plausibly to the imputation of underhand dealing between the King of England and the party represented by the bishop, is the reference to the choice of a king "that will follow your counsel." This, seeing that part of Edward's avowed policy had been to obtain the homage of the Scottish monarchy, is untrue to what afterwards came to be the principles and sentiments of patriotic Scotsmen; but it is impossible to show that there was any party in Scotland at that time which seriously disputed the King of England's claim. The executive, in the name of the nation, referred the dispute to him.

Lord Hailes throws discredit on the statements of

Fordun, Hemingburgh, and others that the invitation sent to Edward I. to arbitrate in the disputed succession was one of a national character. He was not aware of the appeal made on behalf of the Seven Earls of Scotland, claiming to represent the pre-feudal, and therefore the true constitution of the realm.\* This is an instrument containing the minutes of proceedings instituted by the Seven Earls, and conducted for them by procurators appearing before the Bishop of St. Andrews and John Comyn, the operative Guardians. Herein it is set forth that, according to the ancient laws and immemorial usage of the kingdom of Scotland, it appertained to the rights and liberties of the Seven Earls and the "Communitas" of the realm, whensoever the throne should become vacant, to constitute the King and invest him with all the functions of government. And now, the throne being vacant by the death of Alexander III., and lest the Bishop of St. Andrews and John Comyn, acting as Regents of Scotland, together with the small portion of the "Communitas" adhering to them, should of their own authority appoint any King to the prejudice of the rights of the Seven Earls, and lest also John de Balliol should intermeddle in the kingdom or government of Scotland, appeal was hereby made to Edward King of England, on account of the injury thus received.

After further protest is lodged on behalf of Donald Earl of Mar against the damage and ravages committed in the district of Moray by certain deputies

\* The document is printed in full in Palgrave, 14-23.

appointed by the Guardians, the Seven Earls proceed to appeal in the name and on behalf of Robert de Brus, Lord of Annandale, claiming the Crown as the lawful and appointed heir of King Alexander. They complain that the Guardians, uniting with others of the kingdom, as well in prejudice of the rights of de Brus as in violation of the privileges of themselves as the Seven Earls, had intended to appoint John de Balliol to the vacant throne. Wherefore he, Robert de Brus, so appearing by his procurator, appeals to the presence of Edward King of England, and inhibits the proceedings of the Guardians, until the judgment of the said King can be obtained.

Commenting further on Hemingburgh's statement that the invitation to Edward was an act on the part of the Scottish nation, Lord Hailes says he does not doubt that *many* of the nobles, instigated by Bishop Fraser, may have invited the intervention of England; "but," says he, "I see no sufficient evidence that the measure was *national*." Seeing, however, that not only the Scottish Guardians, but the more ancient constitutional body of the Seven Earls, independently took the same course, it surely partook as much of the nature of a national act as the constitution of the nation admitted. It is easy for a historian to write about the "general consent" of a nation, but it is not so easy to prove that it is more than a mere phrase. No provision for a plebiscite existed under the feudal system, and it is impossible to imagine that the commonalty were able to take any intelligent interest in the question of



succession to the throne. The estates, indeed, were held to represent the people, and they took a keen interest in the matter, but they were in no degree representative in our modern acceptance of that term. The national will was interpreted by the acts of a narrow, and chiefly alien, aristocracy, consisting of prelates and barons; and the fact that the commonalty of Scotland, many years after this, ratified the act of de Brus, representing one of many competitors, in seizing the Crown, is not enough to convict either Fraser and his colleagues or the Seven Earls of bad faith or want of patriotism, because they took measures to prevent de Balliol or de Brus, or any other competitor, dragging the country into civil war in support of his claim.

In the act of inviting Edward to arbitrate there was nothing to compromise the independence of Scotland. It was the practice at that time to settle controversies of this nature by reference to a foreign prince. Edward's reputation, both as a statesman and a knight, stood high; he had already, by the project of marriage of his son to the Queen of Scots, shown himself well disposed to the northern kingdom; and the two parties in Scotland adopted the most hopeful way out of the crisis. But in the transactions which followed, it soon became clear that the first use the King of England intended to make of his opportunity was to settle in his own favour the venerable dispute about the suzerainty. It happened to be a burning question with him just at the time, for he was at war with the King of France, who claimed his homage for the duchy of Aquitaine.

A conference between the prelates and barons of Scotland on one side, and King Edward and his ministers on the other, took place at Norham, on the English bank of the Tweed, on May 10, 1291. It was opened by a memorable speech on the part of the King of England, composed in Latin by William Hotham, Provincial of Predicant Friars, and delivered in French by Roger le Brabazom, Justiciary of England. It announced the King's acceptance of the office of arbitrator, "out of his good-will and affection to the whole nation, and to each individual in it; for in their defence he himself was interested." He had come, he said, as Superior and Lord Paramount of the kingdom of Scotland, and he required, as a preliminary act, that they should acknowledge him as such.

The Scots requested time to consider such a weighty demand; they were given twenty-four hours. Next day they asked for further delay. Edward granted them three weeks, by which time his demand would be emphasised by a display of force, for he had summoned the barons of northern England to assemble at Norham, *cum armis et equis*, on June 3d. It is to be noted that among his English lieges thus called to arms, there were included two, at least, of the competitors, namely, Robert de Brus and John de Balliol.

Besides these military preparations, Edward took pains to collect historical evidence in support of his claim to the suzerainty, and it is impossible for any impartial person to doubt the sincerity of his desire not to exceed what he believed to be his just rights.

Religious houses were considered then the only authentic repositories of such material, and orders had been sent to all of them to extract and cite every recorded instance of homage done by the Kings of Scotland to those of England. These reports had been read at the preliminary conference on May 10th, and they remain to this day an interesting medley of historical fact and monkish legend. All the instances of partial conquest of Scottish territory by Saxon, Danish, and Norman kings, followed by homage done by the vanquished, were herein recited, down to the treaty of Falaise, by which William the Lion, in order to regain his freedom, surrendered the independence of his kingdom. But no mention was made of the treaty of Canterbury whereby it was restored by Richard Cœur de Lion; of the clause in Magna Charta defining the rights of the Scottish kings; nor of the recent obligation entered into by Edward himself at Birgham, to respect the independence of Scotland. The last, at any rate, must have been fresh in the recollection of all present.

The conference re-assembled on June 2d, this time on Scottish soil, at Upsettlington, on the north bank of the Tweed. Eight of the claimants to the throne were present, but not John de Balliol, who said he had mistaken the day.

The others were :

1. Robert de Brus, Lord of Annandale.
2. Florence, Count of Holland.
3. John de Hastings, Lord of Abergavenny.
4. Patrick de Dunbar, Earl of March.

5. William de Ros.
6. William de Vesci (appearing by attorney).
7. Robert de Pinkeny.
8. Nicholas de Soulis.

The Bishop of Bath recited the proceedings at the former assembly, and added, in reference to the historical researches commanded by the King, that—“by various evidences, it was sufficiently apparent that the English kings were Lords Paramount of Scotland, and from the most distant ages had either claimed or possessed that right; that Edward had required the Scots to produce their evidences or arguments to the contrary, and had declared himself ready to admit them if they were stronger than his own. . . . That as the Scots had produced nothing, the King was resolved, as Lord Paramount, to determine the question of the succession.” Then the competitors were called on to declare their concurrence.

Robert de Brus was first asked if he acknowledged the King of England as Lord Paramount of Scotland, and whether he was willing to ask and receive judgment of him in that character. De Brus gave his assent “definitely, expressly, publicly, and openly,”\* and the other competitors present answered these questions in the same way.

Next day, June 3d, John de Balliol made his appearance, and, having explained the cause of his absence at the appointed time, was asked if he was ready to make the same answer as the others. After

\* Finaliter, expresse, publice et aperte.—*Fœdera*.

some deliberation—merely formal, because he must have known what was coming\*—he replied that he was.

The English Chancellor then announced that, although King Edward “now asserted his right of superiority, with the view of giving judgment between the competitors, he must not be held to relinquish his right of property in the kingdom of Scotland, which might be claimed hereafter in fit manner and time convenient.” It is not clear whether this ambiguous phrase referred to his legitimate claim to the earldoms of Lothian and Scottish Cumbria, for which homage had been so long and persistently claimed, or to the groundless claim to property in the Scottish realm as a whole.

The competitors then set their seals to the following acknowledgment :

“Forasmuch as the King of England has evidently shown to us that the sovereign seignory of Scotland, and the right of determining our respective pretensions, belong to him, we, therefore, of our own free will and without compulsion, have agreed to receive judgment from him as our Lord Paramount, and we become bound to submit to his award.” †

Besides the nine competitors named above, four others subsequently submitted their claims on August 3d, namely, Eric King of Norway, John Comyn Lord of Badenoch, Roger de Mandeville, and Patrick Galythly. It is remarkable, as shewing how complete was the Norman ascendancy in the ancient land of the Gael and Pict, that although all these thirteen competitors for the throne of Scotland claimed in virtue of descent from daughters or sis-

---

\* Congrua deliberatione præhabita.—*Fædera*.

† *Fædera*.

ters of Scottish kings (except King Eric, who founded on being the heir of his own daughter), only one, Patrick Galythly, was indeed a native Scot.

The claims of eleven of the thirteen competitors require no consideration here. From the first, those of John de Balliol and Robert de Brus were recognised as the most important, and were taken into consideration at once.

Each of these two was called on to nominate forty commissioners, who, with twenty-four appointed by the King, were to deliberate on the pleadings and make their report to him. The claims of the other competitors, though not withdrawn, were suspended until after the decision between de Brus and de Balliol.

On June 4th all the competitors consented to the surrender of the kingdom of Scotland and its fortresses into Edward's hands, on the pretext (for it could have been nothing but a quibble) that, inasmuch as the bestowal of the kingdom had been placed in his hands, he could not bestow that which he did not possess. Restitution was to be made within two months from the delivery of his award. This surrender was carried into effect on June 11th, whereupon Edward immediately restored the custody of the kingdom to the four Guardians, and the castles to the keepers. The only Scottish official who made the slightest difficulty over this manœuvre was Gilbert de Umfraville, Earl of Angus, who demanded and received an indemnity from King Edward before he would consent to deliver up his castles of Dundee and Forfar.

The Scottish nobles and prelates, on June 11th, presented Alan, Bishop of Caithness, as a fit Chancellor, and Edward appointed him, with his own clerk, Sir Walter de Amundesham, as colleague. He also, on June 13th, appointed Brian fitz Alan as an associate with the four Guardians, who now held their commission as regents from him as Overlord. These regents, with twenty-seven other earls and barons of Scotland, then swore fealty to Edward on the Holy Evangelists, and proceedings were adjourned till August 2d.

Nothing could be more formal and complete than the absolute renunciation of Scottish independence which had now been performed. Upon Balliol and Bishop Fraser has been laid, by common consent of all Scottish historians, the odium, not only of being foremost in obsequious compliance with Edward's pretensions, but in subsequently resisting the national effort to regain independence. But in truth the records admit of no difference in this respect between the competitors at this period. They and the Guardians were unanimous in acknowledging Edward's superiority, and if there was any party in Scotland of a contrary view, no trace remains of any protest having been made at this time. If the proceedings at Norham and Upsettlington were, as Lord Hailes maintains, chapters in a disgraceful history, then the disgrace must be shared by all Scotsmen who took part in them. Their acts were the acts of the nation, as far as the constitution of the kingdom admitted of any act being national; nor is it easy to point out how they could have acted differently. Dissensions

among themselves rendered war against Edward, who was the liege lord of most of them for their English possessions, a hopeless enterprise ; in yielding voluntary submission they were anticipating the submission which must have been forced from them after a bloody contest. It is a bitter thing for a Scotsman, even at this distance of time, to have to admit that his country was helpless before the King of England's pretensions, but so it was. The fierce detestation of Edward of England, which generations of Scotsmen have learned to cherish, had no existence at the time of the proceedings of Upsetlington ; it arose out of subsequent events. Hitherto he had been regarded, not as an aggressive tyrant, but as a powerful friend of Scotland, nearly related in blood to the lost line of Malcolm Canmore, and the most likely authority to deliver the realm from the evils of a disputed succession. That he should exact a substantial fee for his services as arbitrator, might be regretted, but there was no power to resist the demand. If this state of things be lost sight of, no clear view can be obtained of the momentous events of these years.







Comyn, Earl of Buchan.



Sir Aymer de Valence.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE REIGN OF JOHN DE BALLIOL.

A.D. 1291-1296.

THE commissioners appointed in June to decide the merits of the respective claims of de Brus and de Balliol, adjourned till August 2d, when they re-assembled at Berwick. Their proceedings have been so minutely examined and reported on by previous writers, that there is no occasion here to do more than briefly recapitulate the grounds on which they gave their verdict. Pleadings on behalf of the two competitors were opened at Berwick on June 2, 1292, and continued till June 25th.

John de Balliol claimed as the son of Devorguila, daughter of Margaret, *eldest* daughter of the Earl of Huntingdon, the youngest brother of Malcolm IV. and William the Lion. He was, therefore, great-grandson of the Earl, and great-grand-nephew of two Kings of Scotland.

Robert de Brus claimed as the son of Isabella,

*second* daughter of the said Earl of Huntingdon. He was, therefore, grandson of the Earl, and grand-nephew of the two Kings.\*

It was a nice question, and one that had never, up to that time, been decided in feudal law, whether the succession ought to devolve on the more remote by one degree in descent from the elder sister (de Balliol), or on the nearer in degree from the younger (de Brus). So completely had Scotland become feudalised, that although the question involved was one of descent from her Celtic monarchy, the ancient Celtic law of Tanistry, by which succession had been wont to be regulated, does not seem to have been so much as mentioned. Under that law, succession went by descent from a common ancestor, but choice had to be made by the people of a man come to years fit for war and council, instead of the infant son or grandson of the last king.

The commissioners, having no precedent to guide them, felt unable to create one. They reported to the King on August 12th, that they had not been able to come to an agreement upon the question submitted to them, and declared "that they would not presume to give their advice in such a high matter without hearing the better judgment of the prelates, nobility, and other wise men of England."

The sitting was again adjourned, and Edward sum-

---

\* John de Hastings, grandson of Ada, the *third* daughter, was a competitor also ; but he only claimed one third of the kingdom, on the ground that, like other inheritances, it was divisible. His claim was disposed of by the preliminary decision that the kingdom, unlike other inheritances, was indivisible.

moned a Parliament to meet at Berwick on October 15, 1292. Three questions were submitted for its decision on behalf of the King of England, to all of which Parliament returned unanimous answers. The tenour of these answers threw upon the King the responsibility of decision in the matter under dispute, according to the laws and usages of his kingdoms. If no such laws and usages existed, or if they differed in England and Scotland, then he should create new ones, with the advice of Parliament. The succession to the Crown should be regulated in the same way as succession to earldoms, baronies, and other indivisible inheritances.

Next, on November 6th, the two claimants-in-chief were heard at great length and in great detail; after which, all the other competitors, except de Hastings, having finally withdrawn their claims, King Edward proceeded to deliver judgment on November 17th.

“As it is admitted that the kingdom of Scotland is indivisible, and as the King of England must judge the right of his subjects according to the laws and usages of the kingdoms over which he reigns; and as by the laws and usages of England and Scotland in the succession to indivisible heritage, the more remote in degree of the first line of descent is preferable to the nearer in degree of the second, therefore it is decreed that John de Balliol shall have seisin of the realm of Scotland . . . saving always the right of the said King of England and his heirs, whenever they shall choose to put it forward.”

It is beyond all question that, according to the law of primogeniture, as it has since been interpreted and as it would take effect at the present day, this was an equitable decision. This law, however, was not firmly established at that time, and the Scottish

chroniclers do not hesitate to impute bad faith to Edward in pronouncing judgment. Fordun and Wyntoun declare that the commissioners delivered their award in favour of de Brus, but that the Bishop of Durham dissuaded the King from ratifying it, because de Brus would prove far too powerful a monarch. They allege further, that the Earl of Gloucester stood before King Edward, holding his kinsman, de Brus, by the hand, and cried: "Recollect, O King! what kind of judgment thou hast given this day; and know that thou must be judged at the last." But there is no reason to suppose that Edward saw in de Balliol a more pliant vassal than in the aged de Brus. Bishop Fraser, at all events, had put him as much on his guard against one as against the other.

Of a truth there is not a shred of evidence to support the allegation that de Brus expressed any dissent from the award, whatever may have been his private feelings and those of his partisans. Of far greater significance is the fact that, in giving his award, Edward made no reference to that part of de Brus's case which, though the strongest of all, has been overlooked or set aside by all subsequent critics, until Sir Francis Palgrave pointed out its true bearing on the question. It was part of de Brus's pleadings, that in 1238, when King Alexander II. was in declining years, despairing of any issue of his body, he did with, and by the assent of the *probi homines* of his kingdom, acknowledge and designate the Lord of Annandale to be his lawful heir, as being nearest of blood to himself. Many of the

barons who took part in this parliamentary act being still alive in 1292, de Brus claimed that they should be examined in support of his averment. De Balliol's answer to this was that, inasmuch as Alexander II. had died seised of the kingdom, and transmitted it by his death to a son, not in existence at the time he designated de Brus as his heir, no right could remain with Robert de Brus in virtue of such designation. Of our historians, Brady, Tyrrel, Hume, Turner, and Lingard are alike totally silent in regard to this remarkable part of de Brus's claim. Tytler mentions it, but without comment; Carte denounces it as "a mere pretence." Lord Hailes enters with some minuteness into its discussion, but concludes against its validity on grounds somewhat extraordinary for such a high judicial authority to take up. He says that de Balliol's answer ought to have been that the opinion and act of Alexander II. could not vary the rules of succession, and that "the constitution of Scotland, and the fate of the competitors, must not depend upon the testimony of witnesses concerning words cursorily heard more than a century ago. . . . The situation of Alexander II. renders it incredible that he ever uttered the words ascribed to him by Bruce, and which he pretends to prove by the evidence of witnesses, certainly superannuated, and probably not impartial."

But in fact Alexander's act was a proceeding far more deliberate and constitutional than Lord Hailes suspected. Since that writer compiled his *Annals*, the appeal of the Seven Earls, above quoted, has come to light; by which it appears that the line of

defence recommended by Hailes was not open for de Balliol to take. So far from Alexander's words having been "cursorily" uttered or heard, they were spoken in and ratified by the National Assembly.

"The Great Council being assembled together, they decreed and adjudged by all their own laws, and by the imperial and other laws, that the son born of the second sister should inherit in preference to the daughter born of the eldest sister. And all present, Clergy as well as Laity, unanimously declared the same as the true judgment of the King. Such judgment having been given by the Great Council and accepted by the Sovereign, he, King Alexander, took Robert de Brus, Lord of Annandale who now is, by the hand, and presented him to all the nobles and magnates, clerks, and laymen then and there present, as his true and legitimate heir to the kingdom of Scotland; and all such magnates, by the King's command and in his presence, took the oath of fealty to the Lord Robert de Brus upon the Holy Gospels. And this act or deed was duly recorded upon the rolls of the Treasury of Scotland: but the memorialists know not into whose hands it has fallen." \*

One cannot but suspect that, had the Lord of Annandale been less heavily stricken in years—"superannuated," to use Lord Hailes's expression,—this part of his claim would have been more stoutly supported. The fact that he had received the fealty of certain barons of Scotland then living, is quite enough to account for the rising in his favour on the death of the Maid of Norway, and certainly puts that transaction, hitherto so obscure, in a less ambiguous light. Nor can it have been absent from the thoughts of Annandale's grandson,

\* Palgrave, Introduction xvii., and pp. 14-24, where the appeal of the Seven Earls will be found printed at length.

the greater de Brus, when he resolved, after long hesitation, to enforce his claim to the throne.

Power was taken in the settlement for the King of England to interfere as Lord Paramount, in the event of de Balliol neglecting to rule his people justly. On November 19, 1292, the kingdom and castles of Scotland were handed over to King John. On the following day he did fealty to King Edward; the great seal used by the Guardians was broken in pieces, and the fragments deposited in the English Treasury, in token of the superiority of England over Scotland. It did not take long to cut a new seal, for the impression thereof remains attached to King John's letters patent, written from Newcastle-on-Tyne on December 24th, announcing to the Scottish people the fact that he had sworn fealty to King Edward on November 20th foregoing.\*

The coronation took place at Scone on St. Andrew's Day (November 30th), and once more King John did homage for his kingdom, on December 26th, at Newcastle-on-Tyne. The national manuscripts of Scotland were delivered to the new King, and an indenture taken. Most, if not all, of these papers, which would now be of incalculable value, have since perished.

\* A large round seal in green wax. *Obverse*: the King in chain mail and surcoat, barred helmet crowned, and sword in hand, riding to sinister. The Scottish lion rampant double and tressure are on the shield and housings. *Reverse*: the King on a carved seat, sceptred. At dexter side, a shield charged with an orle (Balliol); at the sinister, one with a lion rampant (Galloway). Legend on both sides: JOHANNES DEI GRATIA REX SCOTORUM.

On January 2, 1293, King John issued letters patent, releasing King Edward from all writings, agreements, promises, obligations, and penalties entered into during the time that the realm of Scotland was in his hands. It is notable that neither the seal of de Brus of Annandale, nor that of his son the Earl of Carrick, is to be found among those of the Earls of Buchan, March, Angus, and Athol, John Comyn of Badenoch, and many others appended to this document.

In depositing this instrument in Westminster, Edward executed a notarial protest, the tenour of which soon brought about a strain on the unworkable relations between the two Kings. It was to the effect that the King of England was not to be hindered by any interim promises already made from doing justice in appeals brought before his Court from Scotland.\* Consequently, in October of the first year of John's reign, proceedings were taken at Westminster on the appeal of Macduff, descended of a former Earl of Fife, against the judgment of the Bishop of St. Andrews, by which he had been dispossessed. There was also appeal made in another case, that of a burghess of Berwick. Further, on April 2, 1294, King Edward, as Overlord of Scotland, required his "beloved and faithful" † John, King of Scotland, to appear at Westminster to answer to the claim of John Mazun, a merchant of Gascony, for wines, etc.,

\* Bain, ii., 155.

† *Ibid.*, 160. "Beloved" was an afterthought; "magnifico principi"—magnificent prince—was written first, scored out, and "dilecto" substituted.



supplied to the deceased King Alexander, to the amount of £2,000, and not paid for. Moreover, this summons was served upon King John in the most peremptory fashion, by the hands of the Sheriff of Northumberland.\* Besides this indignity, King John had, in the previous year, received Edward's commands to serve on the *justice eyre* of Yorkshire, just as if he had been any ordinary subject. John wrote to remonstrate against this duty being expected of him,† but it does not appear that he obtained exemption, for events shortly took an acute turn.

On June 29th, Edward, whose orders always appeared under his title as Overlord of Scotland, commanded John, King of Scots, to join him in London, on September 1st, with eighteen of the magnates of Scotland, for operations against King Philip IV. of France. Now it was plainly intolerable, under any circumstances, that Scotland should be obliged to send forth her King, whom it had cost her so much trouble to get, and the flower of her chivalry, to fight the private quarrels of the King of England. But it happened to be peculiarly inconvenient at that particular moment, as King Edward was probably fully aware, for de Balliol (his reign was so short and inglorious that it is hardly necessary to refer to him as King John any more) had entered into secret negotiations with Philip. He had, no doubt, been convinced by the proceedings in the appeal cases that his relations with Edward could not endure very

---

\* Bain, 160.

† *Ibid.*, 157.

long, so he sagaciously set about cultivating the friendship of Edward's foe.

De Balliol paid no attention to Edward's summons. The secret treaty with Philip must have come to Edward's ears before its publication on October 23, 1295, for on the 16th orders were issued for the seizure of all de Balliol's lands and goods in England, as well as those of all Scotsmen who remained in Scotland.\* De Balliol, strong in the sense of his offensive and defensive alliance with the King of France, at last threw down the gauntlet to Edward. He wrote, in October, 1295, complaining of the injuries inflicted on his subjects, the violent occupation of his castles and possessions, the slaughter and imprisonment of the merchants and other men of his realm; wherefore he renounced the homage "extorted from him by violence."† No doubt this was technically an act of rebellion, for both de Balliol and his barons had sworn fealty to the King of England. The "violence" referred to could only mean Edward's display of force at the conference of Upsettlington.

Both countries now prepared for war. On March 14, 1296, King Edward received the homage of the Earl of Lennox and ninety others, landowners in Scotland. Robert de Brus, the Competitor, was dead, having departed from this stormy scene, a very old man, before May, 1295;‡ but Edward had,

---

\* Bain, ii., 166.

† *Ibid.*, 167.

‡ *Ibid.*, 164.

in October of the same year, appointed his son, known in future controversy as Robert de Brus "le viel," governor of the important castle of Carlisle.\* Strangely enough, it fell to his lot to strike the first blow for the monarch whose decision had shut him out from the throne of Scotland; for the army of de Balliol invaded Cumberland on March 26th, and invested Carlisle on the 28th. Here, too, were the Bruce and the Comyn first arrayed in battle against each other; for John Comyn, Earl of Buchan, commanded de Balliol's forces, and John Comyn, son of the Lord of Badenoch, and the same who afterwards fell by the dagger of Robert I., marched with him.

The attack on Carlisle was repulsed, and Buchan turned eastward, making a bloody raid on Tynedale, burning Hexham and Corbridge (April 8th), and, according to English accounts, perpetrating horrible cruelties. It is stated in a notarial instrument subsequently drawn up on King Edward's behalf, that "Herodian" barbarities were committed by the Scots on pregnant women, and that two hundred "little clerks" (school-boys) were burnt in the schools at Corbridge.† Possibly this atrocious course was adopted in reprisal for what had been enacted at Berwick, which King Edward stormed on March 30th, massacring the inhabitants without distinction of age or sex.

The sack of Berwick claims more than passing

---

\* Bain, ii., 166.

† *Ibid.*, ii., 217.

notice, so deeply has it stained the reputation of Edward I. In the whole course of the War of Independence there was enacted nothing to approach the horror of it.

The King of England crossed the Tweed below Coldstream on March 28th ; the Bishop of Durham crossing with another contingent lower down, at Norham. An attack by the English fleet had, some days previous, been repulsed by the people of Berwick with a loss, says Fordun, of no fewer than eighteen ships burnt, and their crews slain.

The combined English forces having been drawn up under the walls of Berwick, the town was summoned to surrender. Edward waited twenty-four hours for an answer ; when it came, it was a proud refusal. He then withdrew towards Coldstream, where he encamped. As was customary before an important engagement, a grand parade was held for the creation of knights. Henry de Percy was the most distinguished of those so honoured on this occasion. The Admiral of the English fleet, which was lying off Berwick, seeing the army in battle array, concluded that an immediate assault had been ordered, and prepared to co-operate. Entering the river, his foremost vessel went aground, as did three others. All were burnt by the Scots, and the crews were killed.

This was followed by the storming of the town by the English. It is said that the assailants were greatly infuriated by derisive verses shouted at them from the ramparts. Of these the various versions preserved seem, if anything, deficient in salt, but

doubtless they carried their sting at the time. Here is one of them :

“ Kyng Edward !  
    wanne thu hauest Berwic,  
                    pike the !  
    wanne thu hauest geten,  
                    dike the ! ”

The defences of the town were weak and resistance was soon overcome. The Earl of Cornwall's brother Richard, raising his visor to get a better view of the yielding foe, was struck in the forehead by a dart and killed. This greatly enraged the King, who incontinently gave the order “ No quarter ! ” The slaughter went on for two whole days. Scottish historians agree with the English writer, Walter of Hemingburgh, in putting the number of those slain at between seven and eight thousand. Wyntoun says that what brought the massacre to an end at last, was that Edward himself saw a woman, in the act of childbirth, being put to the sword. At this horrible sight he turned away, crying “ *Laissez, laissez !* ”

The Flemish merchants of Berwick possessed a strong building called *Aula Rubra*, or the Red Hall. By their charter they were bound to defend this to the last against the English. Right well did the gallant fellows fulfil their engagement. They held out, after the town had been taken, till evensong, when the English set fire to their Red Hall, and its thirty defenders all perished in the flames.

The garrison of the castle were allowed to depart, after swearing they would never again bear arms

against England ; but their commander, Sir William de Douglas, surnamed "le Hardi," was kept a prisoner.

If Edward intended to strike terror among those whom he regarded as his rebellious subjects, and to crush the resistance to his rule by a display of inhuman severity, never did a ruler more hugely miscalculate a result. He was to learn the same lesson which many of his successors had to lay to heart—that Scotsmen may be led, but they will never be driven.

But the Scots had not yet found a leader whom they could follow. The cause of de Balliol was lost at the battle of Dunbar, where, on April 28th, the Earl of Warrene won a complete victory. King Edward then began a progress through Scotland, exacting fealty from the nobles, and receiving their renunciation of homage to de Balliol and of the French alliance.

James the Steward of Scotland surrendered Roxburgh Castle on May 13th, and swore on the Gospels to aid King Edward against "John de Balliol, late King of Scotland." \* For Edward understood well how to play off the Bruce party against the Balliol.

\* Palgrave, 152. From James the Steward afterwards came the royal house of Stuart, by the marriage of his son Walter the Steward with Marjorie, daughter of Robert I. The title of the office became hereditary as a surname ; but it is curious to remember its early etymology, *i. e.*, the Anglo-Saxon *stige ward*—sty ward, master of the hogs. An important office in primitive times, the term became applied to the seneschal, or head of the royal household, and thence to the chief officer of State.

The true weakness of the national cause lay, at this time, in the civil dissension of the kingdom. But for that, King Edward, whose hands were full enough with the troubles connected with his French dominions, might not have been disposed to concern himself in Scottish affairs. Fordun attributes the loss of the battle of Dunbar to the action of the Earls of Mar and Athol, who, "through good will and love for Bruce," left the field without striking a blow, and rejoiced at the calamity which fell on the arms of "the Comyns and their whole abettors," who stood for Balliol. "But, alas!" he adds, with well-founded regret, "through this quarrel the harmless rabble, exposed to the ravenous bite of these wolves, lay mangled far and wide over the land." \*

The same chronicler also has a story how Edward, in order to secure the support of Robert de Brus, the Competitor's son, did about this time promise to place him on the Scottish throne in place of Balliol; and how, on de Brus claiming this promise after the battle of Dunbar, the King impatiently exclaimed: "*Ne avonis ren autres chose a fer, que a vous reaymys ganere?*"—"Have we nothing else to do but win realms for you?" But, as has been shown above, de Brus was already Edward's man, being at this moment the governor of Carlisle. De Balliol, too, had taken the surest means to alienate de Brus from his cause. After the sack of Berwick, he had declared all the partisans of England, and all neutrals, to be traitors, and their lands confiscated. He be-

---

\* Fordun, xciii.

stowed de Brus's lordship of Annandale upon Comyn, Earl of Buchan, who is believed actually to have entered on possession of Lochmaben Castle.

The fact is, this Robert de Brus "le viel" does not seem to have been a very strong character in any respect. There was a more promising instrument for Edward's purpose in Robert de Brus "le jovene" or "le jeune," and upon him the English monarch laid the duty of receiving back to his peace the people of Annandale and Carrick. This young knight, grandson of the Competitor and, in right of his mother who died in 1292, Earl of Carrick, was now in his twenty-second year.

Thus the first appearance in history of the restorer of Scottish monarchy, was in the pay of the King of England, resisting the national party.

De Balliol's abdication has generally been dated July 2, 1296, the date of certain letters patent, in which he confessed his offences against his liege lord Edward, and delivered to him the Scottish kingdom and people.\* But this instrument was alleged by Fordun, on the authority of Baldred Bissett, the Scottish envoy at Rome, to be a forgery; and the fact that it is not recorded in the Ragman Roll seems to confirm this. But no suspicion attaches to another document executed at Stracathro on July 7th, attesting the renunciation by de Balliol of his treaty with the King of France; or to another done at Brechin on the 10th, whereby he made resignation of his kingdom and people, and of his royal seal. The

---

\* *Fœdera.*



latter he enclosed in a little purse under his privy seal, and delivered to the Bishop of Durham on behalf of the King of England.\*

Thus closed the reign of King John of Scotland, which had lasted three years and seven months, and a second interregnum began, though successive Regents continued to act in the name of the late King. The subsequent movements of the luckless ex-King may be traced in the Public Records of England. His first place of captivity was Hertford, where he remained till August, 1297. He was allowed to amuse himself in hunting, was provided with a suitable retinue, and received seventeen shillings a day for sustenance. From Hertford he was transferred to the greater security of the Tower. Even there he was not debarred from reasonable pleasure. His household contained two esquires, one huntsman and his page, a barber, a chaplain, a steward, a butler, two chamberlains, a clerk of the chapel, a washerwoman, and three lads. He had horses, no doubt, and mention is made of two greyhounds and ten hounds.

He remained an inmate of the Tower till August, 1299, when King Edward summoned him to his presence at Canterbury. Edward was then negotiating a treaty of peace with the King of France, and Rinaldo, Bishop of Vincenza, was the Pope's delegate for furthering the accomplishment thereof. Balliol was committed to the custody of this prelate the result being that he was taken to France, and

---

\* Bain, ii., 188.

moved successively from Wissant to Cambrai, from Cambrai to Chatillon, and from Chatillon to a castle belonging to the abbot of Cluni, whence he was forbidden to remove without special leave. But in 1302 he was allowed to return to his paternal estates in Picardy, where he lived till his death, which did not take place before 1315.\*

King Edward advanced as far north as Elgin. Strict discipline was maintained in his forces; no private plundering was allowed, for it was now his rôle to conciliate a conquered people. But in token of the complete subjection of the country, the King caused the Coronation Stone to be removed from Scone to Westminster, where it has remained to this day.† Besides this, he caused to be sent to London a number of the national jewels, relics, etc.; and, most important of all, one large, and two small

\*Stevenson, Introduction, xlix.

† The Scottish Stone of Destiny is a small block of red sandstone, with a few imbedded pebbles, which may now be seen under the coronation chair of British Sovereigns in Westminster Abbey. It was associated with the mythical origin of the Scottish nation, being reported to have served the patriarch Jacob as a pillow, to have been taken next to Spain, where it made the justice seat of Gathelus, the contemporary of Moses. This worthy was said to have married Scota the daughter of Pharaoh and was reputed the eponymus of the Gaedhal or Gael. With the Gaels it was brought to Ireland, whence Fergus, first King of Dalriadic Scots removed it to Dunstaffnage in Argylehire. Kenneth II. removed it with him to Scone, and all the Scottish kings were crowned on it till 1293. In carrying it to Westminster, Edward, no doubt, hoped for the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy, that wherever the Stone of Destiny went, the monarchy of Scotland would go also. And so it has, but not in the sense that Edward supposed.

coffers, filled with documents, no doubt the records of the kingdom.\*

Of King Edward's tour in the north, many interesting details have been preserved in the Placita Roll of his army. But there is one that transcends them all, as being, in all probability, the first public mention of an individual whose name was soon to be written large in the annals of his country. At the gaol delivery of Perth on August 8th, Matthew of York was accused of entering the house of a woman, in company with a thief, one William le Waleys (Wallace), and robbing her of 3s. worth of beer.† Matthew was a priest and claimed benefit of clergy. Wallace seems to have escaped arrest, for he was not in the gaol. It is not possible to affirm the identity of this le Waleys with the patriot, but it is not improbable, and this escapade at Perth may account for the known fact that William Wallace was an outlaw when he made his appearance in the national cause.

King Edward held a Parliament at Berwick in this year, which has become famous from having produced the document known as the Ragman Roll. This was a submission to Edward as King of Scotland, and it was signed by nearly two thousand Scottish landowners and ecclesiastics, among whom were practically all those who afterwards fought on the Scottish side in the war of independence. Robert de Brus "le viel" and Robert de Brus "le

\* Bain, ii., 221.

† *Ibid.*, ii., 191.


jeovene," Earl of Carrick, signed on August 28th. One famous name may, however, be sought for in vain. There are three le Waleyses from Ayrshire and one from Berwick ; but whether he was, as has been reported, an outlaw at this time for manslaughter, or whether he was already resolved on armed resistance, or for both reasons, William Wallace the Patriot never bowed the knee to King Edward. Perhaps it is not necessary to look further for cause of the absence of his signature from the roll than the fact that, being neither a landowner nor otherwise of importance, he was not required to sign.

As for the young Earl of Carrick, he stood high in royal favour at this time, for, on October 15th, the King commanded his debts to be "attarmed" in the easiest way for him, "for the great esteem he [Edward] has for the good service of Robert de Brus, Earl of Carrick."





Sir Henry de Percy.



Sir Robert de Clifford.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE CAMPAIGN OF WALLACE.

A.D. 1296-1298.

PRACTICALLY, the whole of Scotland had now owned allegiance to Edward I., and it only remained for him to keep what he had won. He left for the south in the early autumn of 1296, having appointed John de Warenne, Earl of Surrey, keeper of the realm, Hugh de Cressingham treasurer, and William de Ormesby justiciar. Disturbance broke out shortly after Edward's departure, for on January 31, 1297, Surrey received strict orders to allow no man to quit Scotland, cleric or layman, and to arrest anyone found carrying letters.

This was probably the beginning of the rising under Wallace. Of the origin and youth of this celebrated man, very little is known, though much has been reported. His biographer, Blind Harry, lived about two centuries later, and his ballad, full as it is of manifest inaccuracy and untruth, is almost

valueless, except as showing what history had become in that time under the influence of popular tradition. His work can only be regarded as an attempt to recite the story as Scotsmen of the fifteenth century, reared in incessant warfare with England, would have liked it to be.

Fordun, writing only eighty years after Wallace had won immortal renown, says vaguely that "though among the earls and lords of the kingdom he was looked upon as low-born, yet his fathers rejoiced in the honours of knighthood. His elder brother, also, was girded with the knightly belt, and inherited a landed estate which was large enough for his station."

The name "le Waleys" means "the Welshman," but that would apply to a family belonging to Strathclyde, which was part of ancient Cumbria or Wales, as distinguished from Scotland proper. The accepted opinion is, that William was the younger son of Malcolm le Waleys of Ellerslie near Paisley, and that he got into trouble early from an irregular course of life. Blind Harry's story is that when William was at school at Dundee, the English governor, Selby, seeing the lad dressed in a fine suit of green, asked him how he dared to wear "so gay a weed," and tried to take his knife from him, upon which Wallace "stiket him to the dead, for all his men that 'ssembled round him."

After many wanderings and adventures, Wallace got back to his mother at Ellerslie. She induced her brother, Sir Rainald de Crauford, King Edward's sheriff of Ayr, to obtain from Sir Henry de Percy,

Warden of Galloway and Ayr, a protection for her son, and he was sent to Sir Walter Wallace of Richardstoun. One day William had caught a lot of fish in the Irvine, which were taken from him by a party of five soldiers riding past with the Warden. Wallace struck one of them with his fishing-rod, and made him drop his sword, which the lad seized and killed the soldier withal. The others closed round him, but Wallace wounded one in the head, cut off the sword hand of another, and the remaining pair galloped after de Percy, crying to him "to abide and revenge his men, who were being cruelly martyred here in this false region." Percy asked how many had attacked them, and, on hearing there was but one, he laughed and vowed that "by him this day he should not be sought."

Now all this is clearly of the nature of fable, and it is only quoted here as an instance of the sort of stuff to be found in Blind Harry. He credits his hero with a number of murders, killing Englishmen wherever he came across them.

There is much confusion among the different accounts of the rising against the English which took place in the spring of 1297. According to the *Chronicle of Lanercost*, usually a trustworthy authority, it was begun by Bishop Wishart of Glasgow and James the Steward. Hailes, following the popular legend, attributes it to Wallace and Sir William de Douglas. Wallace would not be influential enough to cause the rising, but undoubtedly he took an active part in it. Prominent among the insurgents were young Andrew de Moray, afterwards

Wallace's colleague in command of the movement. Robert de Brus "le viel" was still governor of Carlisle, and thither the young Earl of Carrick was summoned, and made to swear on the consecrated host and the sword of Becket that he would be faithful and vigilant in the service of King Edward. He proved his sincerity forthwith, by making a raid on the lands of Sir William de Douglas; but, according to Hemingburgh, promptly repented, declared that this oath had been extorted from him by force, and joined the Scottish insurgents.

Wallace at this time was under arms in Clydesdale. He surprised and slew the King's sheriff at Lanark, Andrew de Livingston.\* Sir Thomas Gray of Hetoun was then an esquire under the sheriff's command, and his son has given, in his *Scalacronica*, an account of the affair, which he often must have heard his father relate. It is not, however, so ample as might be desired, for Gray was severely wounded in the mêlée, stripped, and left for dead. The heat of two burning houses, one on each side of him, kept life in him till the dawn, when William de Lundy found him and took him to shelter.†

The rising speedily gained strength. Edward was on the point of sailing for Flanders, but he had an able lieutenant in the Earl of Surrey. Sir Henry de Percy and Sir Robert de Clifford advanced against the insurgents, and found them encamped near

\* He is usually called Heselrig, which was probably the name of his lands in Scotland, but Andrew de Livingstone was sheriff in 1396.—Bain, ii., 264, 417.

† *Scalacronica*, 123.



Irvine, strong in numbers, as is said, but greatly weakened by dissensions. It is not known who was in command; certainly not Wallace, under whom, a young squire of dubious renown, it would have been impossible for men of the standing of the Bishop of Glasgow, the Earl of Carrick, and Sir William de Douglas to serve. Sir Richard de Lundin, disgusted with the state of matters in the Scottish camp, went over at once to the English, declaring he would not fight for a party that could not agree among themselves. The rest soon came to terms. Forsworn as they were already, de Brus, the Steward and his brother, Douglas, and Lindsay craved the King's peace, and set their seals to the following remarkable confession, drawn up for them by the equally perjured Bishop of Glasgow.

“A tutz iceaus qi ceste lettre verrunt ou orrunt : Robert de Brus, Counte de Carrik, Jeames Seneschal de Escoce, Alisaundre de Lindescie, Johan frerre le Seneschal e William de Douglas, salut z en J'h'u Crist. Comme chose seit a vous tutz : qe com nous ensembent ove la Comune de nos pais esteioms levez encountre nostre Seignur mon Sire Edward p la grace de Dieux Roys de Engleterre Seignur de Irelaunde e Dux de Gwyene, e encountre sa pees eioms en sa seingnurie en sa terre de Escoce et de Gauweie fait arsons, homecides e divers roberies e . . . estre fait p nous e p les nos : nous pur nous e pur tuz iceaus qi a nous furent adhers de la dite Comune a ceo fayre estre tenuz e sousmis a la volente nostre Seignur le Reys avaunt dit a faire les amendes haut e bas a sa volente des ditz homecides arsons e roberies. Sauve a nous les pointz contenuz en un escrit le quel nous avoms de mon Sire Henri de Percy e mon Sire Robert de Clifforth Cheventeins del ost au noble Rey de Engleterre es parties de Escoce. En temoinaunce de queu chose a cest escrit avoms mis nos seaus. . . .

“Escrit a Irewin le noevime jour du mois de Juyl en le an del regne de Reys Edward vintime quint.”

I have given this important document in the original Norman French, as a fair sample of a State paper of the period. Leaving out the formal exordium and conclusion, the vital parts translate as follows :

“ . . . Whereas it is a thing known to you all that we, with the commons of our lands, did rise in arms against our Lord Sir Edward, by the grace of God King of England, Lord of Ireland, and Duke of Guienne, and against his peace, within his lordship in the land of Scotland and Galloway, have committed arsons, homicides, and various robberies . . . we, on our own behalf and on that of those of the said Commons who were our adherents, make submission to the will of our lord the King aforesaid, to make whatsoever amends as may be his pleasure for the said homicides, arsons and robberies ; saving always the points reserved in a writing which we hold from Sir Henry de Percy and Sir Robert de Clifford, commanders of the host of the noble the King of England in Scotland. In witness whereof we have placed our seals on this writing.”

It is difficult to believe that the Earl of Carrick, in joining this insurrection, had any intention of winning back the kingdom for de Balliol. Probably this was the chief point on which the Scottish leaders disagreed. Wallace's subsequent conduct seems to show that his purpose was the restoration of King John ; though this may have been strengthened by the submission and desertion of de Brus at Irvine. De Brus's own motives have been brought pretty clearly to light by the production of a document executed simultaneously with that quoted above, wherein the Bishop of Glasgow, James the Steward, and de Lindsay bind themselves in surety for the loyalty of the Earl of Carrick to King Edward, until he should deliver his daughter Marjorie as a hostage

into the hands of de Percy and de Clifford. Such serious precaution would scarcely have been taken in the Earl's case, unless he had been regarded as the most dangerous conspirator, pushing his own claim to the throne.

Wallace the landless bore no share in the submission of Irvine. Leaving his wealthy colleagues to make the best terms for themselves and their possessions which they might obtain from their Norman friends, he withdrew with all who would follow him into Selkirk forest.\* On July 23d, Sir Hugh de Cressingham wrote from Berwick to King Edward, informing him that Wallace was still holding out.† Hailes mentions Sir Andrew de Moray of Bothwell as the only baron who supported him at this time; but this is an error. In the first place, the titular lord of Bothwell (for the barony had been confiscated by Edward) was Sir William de Moray, an old man living in Lincolnshire by order of the king, in extreme poverty, and subsisting on an allowance from the English Exchequer. In the second place, Wallace's companion was not the knight, Sir Andrew de Moray, but his son, an esquire. Both had been taken prisoners at Dunbar in 1296; Sir Andrew was still confined in the Tower, but his son had been released from Chester Castle, for on August 28, 1297, he received a safe-conduct to visit his father in the Tower.‡ Of this he can have made no use, for he

---

\* This forest was at that time reckoned as extending from Selkirk, through Clydesdale, to the borders of Ayrshire.

† Bain, ii., 238.

‡ *Ibid.*, 177, 246.

was killed at the battle of Stirling on September 11th. It is difficult to see in this safe-conduct, granted at such a time, anything except a ruse to get hold of young de Moray, for he was undoubtedly most active against the English all this summer.

The three Scottish chiefs who had made their submission at Irvine surrendered to their parole at Berwick. Nevertheless, one of them, Sir William de Douglas, must have failed to fulfil some of the conditions exacted; for on July 24th, the constable of Berwick wrote to the King, informing him that "Sir William de Douglas is in your castle of Berwick in irons, and in safe keeping, God be thanked, and for a good cause, as one who has well deserved it. And I pray you, if it be your good pleasure, let him not be liberated for any profit nor influence, until you know what the matters amount to in regard to him personally." \*

In another letter he says: "Sir William de Douglas has not kept the covenants he made with Sir Henry de Percy; he is in your castle of Berwick in my keeping, and he is still very savage and very abusive (*uncore mout sauvage e mout arailles*)." Surrey informed the King that Douglas was imprisoned because, though he surrendered voluntarily, he did not produce his hostages on the appointed day as the others did. He was taken to the Tower on October 12th, where he died some time before January, 1299.†

Edward sailed on his expedition to Flanders in

---

\* Stevenson, ii., 205 *note*.

† Bain, ii., 269.

August, taking with him many of the Scottish knights captured at Dunbar, who were now released on condition of serving the King against France. Among these were five of the family of Comyn, including John "the Red," besides old Sir William de Moray, Sir Simon Fraser, Sir Richard de Siward, and the Earl of Athol. These gentlemen would be much too ready to exchange prison walls for active service, to feel any scruples about the justice of Edward's quarrel with the King of France.

In the north of Scotland the insurrection still went on, keeping the Bishop of Aberdeen, the Earls of Buchan, Mar, and Strathearn, the Countess of Ross, and others actively engaged in the King's service. The constable of Urquhart Castle reported to Edward on July 25th that young Andrew de Moray had besieged him; but that after a night assault, in which several of the garrison were killed and wounded, the besiegers had drawn off. While de Moray was thus engaged in the north, "with a very great body of rogues (*mut grant hoste de felons*)," as the Bishop of Aberdeen expressed it in his report to Edward, Wallace was laying siege to Dundee Castle. On hearing, however, that the English army under the Earl of Surrey was approaching, he drew off his troops to guard the fords and bridge of Forth, and encamped near Cambuskenneth Abbey. Surrey had been recalled on August 18th, in order to accompany the King to Flanders, and Sir Brian fitz Alan appointed Governor of Scotland in his place. But Sir Brian had raised a difficulty about his salary (£1128 8s), which he declared was wholly insufficient

for his expenses; so, on September 7th, the Prince of Wales wrote on behalf of the absent King, requiring Surrey to remain at his post until Scotland should be at peace.\*


Surrey attempted by means of two friars to come to terms with Wallace, but without success, and the English prepared to attack. The Scots lay on and about the Abbey Craig, a picturesque and precipitous height on the north bank of the Forth, which, at the present day is conspicuous among all neighbouring hills by the Wallace Monument, erected thereon in 1861. There was a long wooden bridge across the Forth, the exact position of which is not known. Lord Hailes, accepting the current tradition, suggests that it was at Kildean Ford, about a mile above the present stone bridges. But Wallace's object would undoubtedly be to defend the bridge, which, if situated at Kildean, would have been too far from his position on the Abbey Craig to enable him to do so effectively. The probability is, that this bridge either stood very much where the older of the existing stone bridges now stands, a position affording ready communication between the castle and town of Stirling on the south bank, and Cambuskenneth Abbey on the north bank; or else at a ford lower down, where the river runs nearest to the Abbey Craig. Sir Richard de Lundin (the same who left the Scottish army before the submission of Irvine) vehemently remonstrated when Surrey ordered his vanguard to cross the bridge in face of the enemy, for it was so narrow that not more than two

---

\* Stevenson, ii., 230.

men-at-arms could ride on it abreast. De Lundin offered to show the way over a ford, whereby the Scots might be taken in flank and rear, the main body of English meanwhile keeping them engaged in front. But his strategy was not approved, perhaps because so recent a recruit had not yet secured the confidence of the English commanders. De Cressingham, Treasurer of Scotland, led the way across the fatal bridge, with Sir Marmaduke de Twenge in command of the heavy cavalry. Progress was very slow: it was midday before the English vanguard had formed upon the north bank, and hitherto Wallace had made no sign. But his time had now come. Sending flanking parties along the river banks, he advanced against the front of the enemy and attacked them with fury. Greatly outnumbered, de Cressingham's force was thrown into confusion by this sudden assault, and utterly routed with terrible slaughter. Sir Thomas Gray, whose father, if he was not actually present on that day, knew the ground thoroughly, and, as a soldier, would furnish the chronicler with a trustworthy account of the battle, says that Wallace broke down the bridge which he had allowed the English vanguard to cross, thus separating the enemy into two bodies. De Cressingham, their commander, was slain, and, according to Hemingburgh, flayed, and his skin divided among the victors—*erat enim pulcher et grossus nimis* "for he was comely, and too fat." On the other hand, the Scots suffered deplorable loss in the death of young Andrew de Moray.

The main body of English, witnessing the disaster



THE ABBEY CRAIG AND WALLACE MONUMENT. SCENE OF THE BATTLE OF STIRLING, SEPTEMBER 11, 1297.  
(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)





of their comrades, and being unable to assist them, straightway fell in a panic, set fire to their end of the bridge, and fled, leaving all their baggage. In the whole history of these wars, there is nothing more difficult to understand than the flight of the English army before Wallace's ill-equipped and half-disciplined levies, who were greatly inferior in numbers, and on the far side of the river.

Of course, the immediate result of this tremendous victory—tremendous, that is, as obtained by raw levies over a disciplined and well-equipped force—was that men of all ranks flocked in to the standard of Wallace, who was now recognised as the national champion. Dundee Castle, which on his advance to the Forth, Wallace had left beleaguered by the townspeople, surrendered shortly after the battle. Surrey left the country at the mercy of the Scots, and retreated as far as York, where the barons of northern England were ordered to join him. Wallace marched after him, overrunning Northumberland and Cumberland as far as Newcastle and Carlisle, but Robert de Balliol held the former strength against him, and Henry de Percy the latter. Robert de Brus "le viel" was still governor of Carlisle Castle, but on October 13, 1297, he was directed to give over his command to the Bishop of Carlisle.\* No reason is assigned for this, nor is there any cause to suppose that either he or his son was suspected of complicity with Wallace; but affairs wore a threatening aspect, and it is not improbable that need was apparent for a stronger governor than the elder de Brus.

---

\* Bain, ii., 244.

No sooner was the Bishop installed in his command, than the Scots invested Carlisle for twenty-eight days in November and December, 1297. The want of discipline among Wallace's irregular troops was deplorable, and the people of these counties suffered lamentably from their violence and rapacity.\* But King Edward was on his way home, and a mighty army of 30,000 men† was gathering to avenge Surrey's misfortunes. Edward de Balliol, son of the ex-King John, was sent to the Tower early in December. Wallace withdrew across the Border, and Surrey was at Roxburgh again on February 16, 1298.

During this campaign a protection was granted to the Prior and Convent of Hexham, which is not easy to explain. It is given by "Andrew de Moray and William Wallace (Wallensis), leaders of the army of Scotland, in the name of the noble Prince Lord John, by the grace of God illustrious King of Scotland," etc. Now Sir Andrew de Moray was, as has been shown, a prisoner in the Tower at this time. That his son had been killed at the battle of Stirling, is clearly certified in an inquisition *post mortem* held on November 28, 1300,‡ wherein mention is made of his son, also called Andrew, two and a half years

\* Bain, ii., 245, 249, 261.

† *Ibid.*, 245. These figures may be relied on, being taken from the King's order to levy. Hemingburgh, usually a cautious if partial chronicler, is betrayed into the customary exaggeration of his kind in dealing with numbers, and states that there were 7,000 cavalry and 80,000 infantry. No army of that size has assembled in England within living memory.

‡ *Ibid.*, ii., 300.

of age, dwelling in Moray, *ut credunt*, among the King of England's enemies. This son was afterwards brother-in-law of Robert I., and Regent of Scotland. It is not, therefore, clear why Andrew de Moray's name should have continued to appear in Wallace's proclamations.\*

It seems to have been about this time that Wallace first assumed the title of Governor of Scotland for King John, though most writers have given an earlier date. It was done with the consent of, and probably at the request of, the representatives of the national party,† who must have felt the need of an official designation for their leader; and there is no reason to doubt that Wallace was perfectly honest in his purpose of governing for, and ultimately restoring, de Balliol. Nevertheless, Fordun probably is just in attributing much of the coldness shown toward Wallace by the Scottish magnates to his assumption of this dignity.

Edward advanced into Scotland, by way of Berwick, in June, 1298. The only important resistance he encountered before reaching Edinburgh was at Dirleton, a strong castle, of which the ruins may still be seen to the west of North Berwick. This was taken, after a stout resistance, by Anthony Beck, the warlike Bishop of Durham. The English headquarters were then fixed at Temple-Liston, to the west

\* Another letter of this date has been found in the archives of Lubeck, issued in the names of Andrew de Moray and William Wallace, giving trading facilities in Scotland to the cities of Lubeck and Hamburg.


† Anderson's *Diplomata Scotia*, No. 44.

of Edinburgh. While waiting the arrival of the fleet in the firth, a serious mutiny broke out among the King's Welsh troops, caused, according to Hemingburgh, by wine served out to them too liberally by royal command. It is stated by the same authority that eighteen clerics were killed by the mutineers, and that the English cavalry, in restoring order, slew many of the Welshmen, and the remainder deserted in a body.

The English army was now in great straits because of delay in the arrival of the fleet with stores. Orders had been already prepared, if not actually issued, to return to Berwick, when news came that the Scots were at Falkirk. Edward at once determined to attack them, and on July 21st, his army moved out to a moor on the east side of Linlithgow and bivouacked. During the night, the King, sleeping on the ground, was trampled on by his charger, and, as is said, two of his ribs were broken. Notwithstanding the pain, he appeared on horseback at dawn, and led the advance.

The Scots were found drawn up on rising and broken ground close to Falkirk. Hemingburgh describes their formation so minutely that, as Hailes observes, he must have received his information from an eyewitness. The pikemen, which formed the bulk of Wallace's army, were disposed in four circular masses (*per turmas quatuor, in modus circularum rotundorum*), with mounted spearmen in the middle of each mass.\* The intervals between these masses

\* This is the formation so frequently alluded to by Barbour and Gray as the "schiltrome."



DIRLETON CASTLE.  
*(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)*



were filled with Selkirk bowmen,\* under the command of Sir John of Bonkill, brother of the Steward. The cavalry was formed on the flanks of the line of columns.

A peat moss lay in front of the Scottish position: nevertheless, Edward relied on his cavalry to dislodge the enemy. De Bigod, Earl Marshal, led the first line of cavalry to the attack, and, finding the morass impracticable, made a detour to the left. The Bishop of Durham, in command of the second line, turned to the right, and the two bodies charged the Scots on both flanks simultaneously. The pikemen stood their ground stoutly, but the Scottish cavalry left the field in panic at the first onset. Sir John of Bonkill fell mortally wounded, and Hemingburgh testifies to the devotion of his archers, tall, handsome men, he calls them, who perished round their leader. Still the pikemen held out gallantly, but as often as they repelled the English horse, flights of arrows and showers of sling-stones poured with fatal effect upon their densely serried ranks. At last, Macduff and Graham having fallen, the formation gave way, and terrible carnage ensued. The field of Falkirk was lost and won, and Surrey and Cressingham were avenged.

It is idle to speculate on the numbers of Scots

\* At no period of their history did the Scots rely much on their archers, who were always vastly inferior to the English. It is said that, unlike the English, they did not draw the arrow to the right ear, but discharged it from the hip. The pike was ever the chosen weapon of the Scots, until the introduction of gunpowder, and indeed long after.



slain. Walsingham puts them at the absurd figure of 60,000, probably three times more than Wallace's entire army. Hemingburgh says 56,000, and Buchanan, writing long afterwards from a Scottish stand-point, 10,000. Of the losses on the English side, some certain information is conveyed by the compensation paid by King Edward for 111 horses, killed in this action, the property of his knights and esquires.\* The Scottish chroniclers attempt to explain this great defeat by reason of dissensions between Wallace, Sir John of Bonkill, and Comyn; and the last named knight, who is believed to have commanded the cavalry, has been accused of treachery because his squadron fled. There is not the slightest ground for such a charge. Nothing is known of any disagreement between the Scottish leaders; the subsequent disfavour which fell upon the Comyns would be enough to prompt patriotic historians to repeat any slander about one of that house; but in fact the excellence and numbers of the English cavalry, supported by their famous archers, are quite enough to account for the defeat of the weaker army.

What, it may be asked, was the Earl of Carrick about all this time? Hailes asserts that he joined the national army as soon as Edward crossed the Border. This is founded on the authority of Hemingburgh, who states that, when Edward marched west from Stirling after the battle of Falkirk, Carrick burnt the castle of Ayr, which he held, and retired. But a very different light is thrown upon the attitude of the future King of Scotland while

---

\* Bain, ii., 257, 259.

these affairs were running their course, by certain letters lately published. One of these, dated July 3d, three weeks before the battle of Falkirk, is a request to King Edward by the Earl of Carrick for a renewal of protection for three knights who are with him on the King's service in Galloway.\* In another document, he is commanded by the King to bring 1000 picked men of Carrick and Galloway to join an expedition about to be made into Scotland.† Seeing, however, that there is some doubt about the exact date of these papers, de Brus's attitude during 1298 must be considered uncertain. The testimony of Scottish and English chroniclers is equally untrustworthy, for it was the aim of each, though with different object, to make it appear that he attached himself early to the national cause.

King Edward rested at Stirling till about August 9th; by September 10th he had reached Carlisle, and on November 19th, being then at Newcastle, he appointed Patrick de Dunbar, Earl of March, his captain of the forces and castles in the east of Scotland. The war went on in a desultory sort of way through the remainder of that year.

Cumberland continued to suffer from raids by parties of Scots, and Carlisle being blockaded closely for twenty-eight days ending December 8, 1297, when the approach of Edward from the north caused the invaders to move off.‡ Record has been pre-

\* Bain, ii., 255.

† Undated, but assigned by Bain (ii., 268) to the autumn of 1298, though Stevenson (ii., 178) puts it among the papers of 1297.

‡ Raine, 155.

served of a grisly incident at this time, of the sort which accounts, in some measure, for Edward's reputation among the Scots for extraordinary cruelty. Eleven hostages had been taken from Galloway at the beginning of Wallace's rising, as security for the loyalty of that province, which was suspected of favouring the cause of Balliol. Now hostages were entitled, under the custom of war, to lenient and even hospitable treatment; nevertheless, these unhappy men, who seem to have been of respectable standing, were imprisoned in Lochmaben Castle by the Earl of Surrey on October 23, 1297. On September 8, 1300, one of them was liberated, Robert MacMaster, the sole survivor of the horrors of those three years. \*

---

\* Raine, 156, 157.





Sir John de Maxwell.



Sir Ingelram de Umfraville.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE DEATH OF WALLACE.

A.D. 1299-1305.

THE Earl of Carrick took a more decided line in 1299. On August 20th, Sir Robert de Hastings wrote from Roxburgh a long letter to King Edward of more than common interest, reporting a recent foray made by the Scots under Sir Ingelram de Umfraville, Sir William de Balliol, and others, on Selkirk Forest, then in the keeping of Sir Simon Fraser. Moreover, there had been a meeting held between Bishop Lamberton of St. Andrews, the Earls of Carrick, Buchan, and Menteith, with Sir John Comyn "le fiz" (the Red Comyn) and the Steward of Scotland, in order to plan the surprise of Roxburgh Castle. De Hastings had employed a spy to gain intelligence of their movements, who described how these barons fell out about a demand made by Sir David de Graham for Sir William Wallace's property, as Wallace was going abroad without leave. Wallace's brother, Sir Malcolm,

objected to this, on which Sir David and he gave each other the lie, and drew their daggers. Sir John Comyn seized the Earl of Carrick by the throat, while his kinsman, Buchan, grappled with the Bishop of St. Andrews. However, no blood was shed, and a final agreement was come to that the Bishop, the Earl of Carrick, and Sir John Comyn should be Guardians of the realm; the first named, as principal, having custody of the castles. Carrick and Sir David de Brechin started the same day for Galloway and Annandale, where they attacked Lochmaben Castle, held by Sir Robert de Clifford for the King of England. Buchan and Comyn left for the Highlands, and the Steward and the Earl of Menteith went to raise Clydesdale. The Bishop remained at Stobo, in Selkirk Forest, of which Sir Robert de Keith was appointed warden, with 100 barbed horse and 1500 foot, besides the forest bowmen, to raid the English Marches withal. De Umfraville was appointed sheriff of Roxburgh.\* This fresh distribution of offices, regarded in the light of subsequent events, is sufficiently remarkable.

Little that is definite is known of Wallace's movements after his defeat at Falkirk, but it may be readily believed that he had lost some of his ascendancy in consequence of that event. At all events, the meeting of barons above described may be assumed as hostile to his influence, or de Brus would not have been there. Wallace had, however, been carrying on hostilities in the north, and made a dash at a convoy of supplies for Stirling Castle on St.

---

\* Bain, ii., 525.

Bartholomew's Day.\* His journey abroad, of which the prospect had so profoundly disturbed the harmony of the conclave at Selkirk, was undertaken in the early summer of 1299, with the object of securing the active assistance of King Philip of France and, what was of even greater importance, the favour of the Pope to the Scottish cause. In both of these objects he succeeded eventually; though at first it seemed as though he had run his head into a noose. Philip, being at the time anxious to gain Edward's good-will, put Wallace in prison, and wrote to inform Edward of what he had done, asking if he would accept the custody of the late governor of Scotland. Edward, as may be supposed, accepted the offer eagerly, for the subjugation of Scotland had come to be much nearer his heart than any questions of Continental territory. But something induced Philip to change his mind. He not only set Wallace free, but wrote a letter to Pope Boniface VIII., commending "our beloved William de Walois knight of Scotland" to the favour of his Holiness.† The Pope, in turn, wrote to Edward on June 27th, commanding him to desist from his attempts to conquer Scotland, which he claimed as the property of the Holy See, and to release the Bishop of Glasgow and other ecclesiastics.‡

King Philip had already, in the previous summer, attempted to include the Scots, as his allies, in the truce concluded with Edward at the treaty of Provins,

---

\* Bain, ii., 518.

† *National MSS.*, vol. i., p. lxx.

‡ *Fœdera*.

which the English King peremptorily refused, on the ground that Scotland was his property, and that he possessed the fealty of its prelates and nobles. But any monarch, in those days of ecclesiastical statesmanship and authority, might well hesitate to dispute a claim put forth by the Head of the Church of Rome.

On November 13th, the three Guardians, who were then besieging Stirling Castle, wrote to Edward, offering to cease hostilities on the mediation of the King of France. Edward was, at the moment, pushing forward preparations for a fresh expedition into Scotland; but matters were not going so smoothly between him and his barons as was their wont. A muster of 16,000 men, ordered at Newcastle for the 24th, was postponed by proclamation till December 13th; and when that date came, the barons refused to advance, because of the stormy weather. Stirling, therefore, had to be left to its fate. John Sampson, the constable, with his garrison of 90 men, surrendered to Sir John de Soulis, after suffering severe privation.

The Highlands and Islands were now pretty free from the English. Even in the Lowlands, besides Stirling, the castles of Bothwell\* and Caerlaverock† were held for the Guardians. Of the last named place, Sir John de Maxwell was the lord, who, if Blind Harry may be believed, had entertained Wallace there after the capture of Tibbers and other places in Nithsdale. Caerlaverock stood perilously

\* Bain, ii., 498.

† *Ibid.*; 279.

near Lochmaben, where the English had a strong garrison. Robert de Felton, the constable, wrote to the King in October, 1299, informing him that Caerlaverock was the occasion of great mischief to his garrison and people, but that he (Felton) had scored a success lately against the enemy, and that at the moment of writing the head of the Constable of Caerlaverock adorned the great tower of Lochmaben. He added that the people of Scotland had been made aware of the new alliance between England and France, and were greatly discouraged thereby. He implored the King to turn his face towards Scotland, and his enemies would disperse.

Edward was not slow to act on the invitation. Early in 1300 he ordered large supplies to be collected in England and Ireland, and forwarded to Berwick and Skinburness. Sixteen thousand foot were summoned to muster at Carlisle, where the King, the young Prince of Wales, and the barons joined the army on June 24th. The splendour and perfect equipment of this host have been minutely described by a poet who accompanied the Court.\* This period was the very noontide of chivalry, and the bard has enthusiastically set forth the names, arms, and personal qualities of all the knights. Heraldry was at that time more than merely ornamental; the various arms served to indicate with precision


\* *The Roll of Caerlaverock*, written in Norman French, is preserved in the British Museum. Sir Harris Nicolas, who first edited it for publication in 1828, attributed it to Walter of Exeter, a monk. But there seems no reason to ascribe the poem to him rather than to any one else.



the different knights in the field just as in modern armies different corps are distinguished by their uniforms. The chivalrous science had not been degraded, as it subsequently came to be, to minister to the genealogical pride of great seigneurs. The charges on the shields were kept distinct and brilliantly coloured, so that they might be recognised easily on parade and in battle.

Early in July, King Edward advanced from Carlisle to lay siege to Maxwell's castle of Caerlaverock with 3000 men. "The blaze of gold and silver," says the poet, "and the radiance of rich colours, displayed by the embattled host, illuminated the valley which they occupied. . . . Those of the castle, seeing us arrive, might, as I well believe, deem that they were in greater peril than they could remember ever before. . . . The English knights were habited, not in coats and surcoats, but were mounted on costly and powerful chargers and were well and securely armed against surprise. There were many rich caparisons embroidered on silks and satins: many a beautiful pennon fixed to the lances and many a banner displayed. . . . The days were long and fine: they proceeded by easy journeys, arranged in four squadrons."

To resist this imposing array Caerlaverock contained but sixty men in garrison; but they made a gallant defence. The castle was invested on July 10th, and the English at once went forward to the assault. The defenders kept up such a constant volley of great stones upon the escalading parties that the gay coats of many English knights were



CAERLAVEROCK CASTLE.  
*(From a photograph by Valentine Bras, Dundee.)*



spoilt, and some were killed. But King Edward had brought with him a strong siege train. Battering-rams of the newest design, and robinets and catapults throwing huge stones made such havoc of the defences that at the end of the second day a white flag was displayed from the gate tower in token of surrender. An English arrow, as is said, pierced the hand of him who held it, pinning it to his face. When the garrison marched out, the besiegers were astonished to find how few men composed it.

Of the gallant sixty, many, says the chronicler of Lanercost, were hanged on the trees near the castle as rebels, by order of the King. The author of the *Siege of Caerlaverock*, however, states that their lives were spared by the King's clemency.

From Caerlaverock the English advanced into eastern Galloway, where, although it was the peculiar territory of the Balliols, Edward had some reason to expect support, for the Celtic chiefs of that province had never ceased to resent its partition, under feudal law, among the three daughters of Alan, their last lord. Besides, in 1296, when Balliol first revolted, Edward had conciliated the people of Galloway by releasing from the prison where he had lain for more than fifty years, Thomas, the natural son of Alan, whom they had desired to make their lord. He had, at the same time, restored by proclamation all their ancient liberties and customs, and, at the request of the said Thomas, promised a revision of rents and other favours. In effect, King Edward met with no resistance in Galloway, and his accounts

show that he was scrupulous to pay for all supplies delivered for the use of his army.

But there remained a more potent influence for him to conciliate than the chiefs of the south-west. Pope Boniface's claim to the kingdom of Scotland had been delivered to him during the siege of Caerlaverock. It cannot have been agreeable reading for the proud King, but even the most puissant monarch of Europe had to weigh his thoughts well before incurring the frown of the Vice-gerent of God. So Edward began by releasing Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow, who thereupon took the oath of fealty to the King of England for the fourth time, swearing on the consecrated host, the gospels, the cross of St. Neot, and the Black Rood of Scotland. Nothing is more remarkable in the political history of this period than the freedom with which great men perjured themselves, except, indeed, the value which men continued to attach to the security of an oath.

On October 30th, at the instance of the King of France, a truce was concluded at Dumfries, to endure between England and Scotland till the following Pentecost. This truce Philip exerted himself to get prolonged, but in vain.

England was in no mood at the moment to brook further foreign interference, for Edward and his Parliament were busy at Lincoln drawing up a spirited reply to the Pope's claim to Scotland as a fief of the See of Rome. In matters spiritual, England, her King and people, were the dutiful servants of Holy Church; but in temporal affairs—"Hands

off!" The answer went back, ratified by a hundred seals of English earls, barons, and knights. Voluminous arguments, drawn from sources so remote as Brutus the Trojan, were addressed to his Holiness, to prove the inalienable right of the Kings of England in the Scottish sovereignty. The Pope was informed that he had been deceived by certain "enemies of peace and sons of rebellion, then resident at his Court," wherein the reference to Wallace and his companions is not obscure. The letter concluded that "upon a due consideration and treating of the contents of your memorable letter, the common and unanimous consent of all and singular was, is, and will be, God willing, for ever: that our lord the King ought not to answer judicially before you, nor submit his rights over the realm of Scotland, nor any other of his temporal rights whatsoever, to your doubtful judgment." Whatever opinion may be held of the justice of Edward's claim over Scotland, it must be admitted that he, entertaining no doubts on the matter, played a noble part in its defence, and never did the English Parliament act with greater courage and dignity than they did in supporting their monarch through this controversy.

Preparations for resuming the war on the expiry of the truce were pushed on with energy. King Edward himself took command of 12,000 men at Berwick, assigning to the Prince of Wales, then sixteen years old, the chance of winning his spurs with another army mustered at Carlisle.

Neither force encountered much fighting. Except

the capture of Bothwell Castle, the King had no prize to show when he went into winter quarters at Linlithgow in the autumn of 1301; while the Prince, after traversing Galloway without resistance, found his flank threatened by a force in the hills about Loch Dee, and persevered no further.

All this time the Earl of Carrick continued to act a double part. He was still, in name, one of the Guardians of Scotland, and, as such, was bound to hostility with England. Nevertheless, on February 16, 1302, King Edward, being then at Roxburgh, granted, at the instance of the Earl of Carrick, pardon to one Hector Askeloc for the slaughter of Cuthbert of Galloway;\* and before the end of April following, the Earl and his Carrick tenants had been received to the King's peace.† Simultaneously, on April 6th, King Philip was writing a letter to the Earl of Carrick and John Comyn, "Guardians of Scotland in the name of King John," to say that he had received their envoys, the Abbot of Jedburgh and Sir John Wishart, and fully understood the letters and messages; that he was moved to his very marrow by the evils brought on their country, praised them for their constancy to their King (John), and urged them to persevere. As for the assistance they asked for, he was carefully considering how he could help them, but, bearing in mind the dangers of the road, he had given his mind to the Bishop of St. Andrews (Lamberton), for whom he desired full credence. Philip's precaution was

\* Bain, ii., 328.

† *Ibid.*, 331.

not superfluous. This letter \* fell into the hands of King Edward, though perhaps not till the bishop was taken some years afterwards. Later in the same year the Earl of Carrick attended Edward's Parliament held in October.† The fact is, it behoved him to have a keen eye to his own interests at this time. His father, the old Lord of Annandale, was approaching his end, and the son's rights as heir to the valuable English estates were in jeopardy.

Edward was now straitened for means to pay his troops. A serious mutiny broke out at Berwick in the autumn of 1301, because of arrears of pay;‡ the commanders of other garrisons were clamouring for money;§ so on January 26, 1302, another truce was brought about by French intervention, to endure till St. Andrew's Day, November 30th. Five days before the expiry of this truce, that between England and France was extended till Easter, 1302; but King Edward would not yield to Philip's desire that the Scots should be included in it.

In the summer of 1302 the national party received an important recruit in the person of Sir Simon Fraser, hitherto a trusted official in the English service, who had served in the Earl of March's company at the siege of Caerlaverock. He deserted from Wark Castle, and carried off the armour and horses of his comrade Sir William de Dunolm.¶ He joined Comyn the Guardian, and the first we hear of him under his new colours is at the battle of

\* Bain, ii., 330.

† *Ibid.*, 343.‡ *Ibid.*, 310.§ *Ibid.*, 314.¶ *Ibid.*, 334.



Roslyn, February 24, 1303, where Comyn and he defeated Sir John de Segrave. Comyn and the Bishop of St. Andrews were now acting alone as Guardians of Scotland. Bruce appears to have decided at last to join his fortunes to the English, for among those summoned to meet Edward at Roxburgh on May 12, 1303, was the Earl of Carrick, with all the men-at-arms he could muster and 1000 foot from Carrick and Galloway. \* On July 14th he received an advance of pay from the King, † being at the time Edward's sheriff of Lanark ‡ and governor of Ayr Castle. §

Enormous expense on men and material was incurred for this season's campaign. Two fortified wooden bridges, for the passage of the Forth, were brought from Lynn-Regis under escort of thirty vessels, || besides siege engines in great number and variety. The Scots were well-nigh overpowered. Brechin Castle fell about the beginning of August; Stirling remained the only place of strength still holding out.

On February 9, 1304, Comyn and his friends surrendered on terms at Strathord. These terms cannot, under the circumstances, be considered illiberal, for, with certain exceptions, the offenders were not to suffer in life or limb, by imprisonment or disinheritance. Among those thus leniently dealt with were Sir Edmund Comyn of Kilbride, Sir John de Graham, Sir John de Vaux, Sir Godfrey de Roos, Sir John de Maxwell, and Sir Pierre de Prendergast.

\* *Bain*, 348.

† *Ibid.*, 355.

‡ *Ibid.*, 372.

§ *Ibid.*, 377.

|| *Ibid.*, 352.

The incorrigible Bishop of Glasgow, John Comyn, de Soulis, James the Steward, Sir Simon Fraser, and Thomas du Bois were sentenced to various terms of exile, from one to three years, but these periods were afterwards shortened on condition that the culprits should regain the King's favour by exerting themselves to capture Wallace, who was beyond the pale of mercy.\* There was something manifestly unjust in the decree that treated thus lightly the offences of trebly forsworn subjects, and dealt so harshly with one who had never done fealty to Edward. The English King was every inch a soldier; it had been better for his renown to extend some of his sympathy to the most valiant of his foes. But he was far from doing so. On March 2, 1304, he wrote an impatient letter to the Earl of March reproaching him with slackness in proceeding against Wallace. "We are much astonished," he said, "why you act so leisurely, unless it be to fulfil the proverb

Quant la guerre fu finée  
Si trest Audegier sespée.

(when the war was finished then Audegier drew his sword)." Next day, strict orders were issued to Sir Alexander of Abernethy, who was in pursuit of Wallace in the parts about Menteith, that on no account were any terms to be offered to him and his followers, except unconditional surrender.† It is not pleasant to read another letter written by the

\* Palgrave, ii., p. cxxxvii., *et seq.*

† Stevenson, ii., 471.

King on the same day to the Earl of Carrick, applauding his diligence in hunting the patriot, and urging him earnestly "as the cloak is well made, so also to make the hood." \*

Edward held a Parliament at St. Andrews in mid-Lent, 1304, where the Earl of Carrick and the Bishop of Glasgow attended, after which the siege of Stirling was begun in earnest. The King wrote to the Prince of Wales, directing him to strip lead from all the churches near Perth and Dunblane, taking care not to uncover the roofs over the altars. † It is no more than fair to add that the war material thus appropriated was scrupulously paid for at a subsequent date.

Robert de Brus "le viel," Lord of Annandale, died about this time, and the Earl of Carrick went to London and Essex to look after his succession and collect his rents. Of the latter, he wrote to the King at the beginning of April to say that he had not succeeded in getting a penny. But besides his private affairs, de Brus, from prudential motives, was diligent in the King's service—none more so; and on April 16th Edward wrote thanking him for sending siege engines to Stirling. On May 1st orders were issued from Stirling for inquisitions on the Earl's lands in Essex, Huntingdon, and Middlesex, ‡ after which, on June 14th, de Brus, having done homage

\* Bain, ii., 383.

† Stevenson, ii., 481.

‡ Bain, ii., 400. There is a warning in these inquisitions against too implicit reliance on early documents. Bruce's age is variously stated therein at 22, 28, and 30 years. He was, in fact, just under 28.

and fealty, was served heir, and three days later his debts to the King were respited. It would be idle to refuse to see, in Bruce's dutiful attitude to King Edward, the anxiety of the heir to secure his rich inheritance. So hardly shall they that have riches ——— !

The storm, long gathering, at length burst on Sir William de Oliphant and the gallant defenders of Stirling Castle. High on their precipitous rock they had watched the vast preparations for their destruction ; and now thirteen great engines, the very latest inventions of military science, hurled missiles against the walls and wildfire into the castle. These machines all bore names, registered as precisely as those of modern battle-ships. There were the Lincoln and the Segrave, the Robinet and the Kingston, the Vicar and the Parson, the Berefrey, the Linlithgow, the Bothwell, the Prince's, the Gloucester, the Dove-dale, and the Tout-le-monde, besides a mighty " war-wolf," the like of which had never been seen.\* An oriel window was built in the King's house in the town, in order that the Queen and her ladies might watch the progress of the siege.† Outside, in the town, it was a pleasant picnic in the summer weather, but within the fortress provender soon began to run low ; yet no sign of surrender was made till July. On the 20th of that month Oliphant submitted unconditionally, but Edward would not allow any of his troops to enter the castle till he had tried on it the effect of his war-wolf (*tauntqz il eit ferru ove le Lup*

\* Bain, ii., 420.

† *Wardrobe Accounts.*

*de guerre*). The garrison were warned to seek what shelter they could before the shot was fired.

Olipphant and his men were afterwards made to go through a humiliating mummery of contrition for the benefit of the ladies, with pretended tears (*tremulos et quasi cum lacrymis*), and then were shipped off to various castles in England as prisoners of war. Olipphant remained a prisoner till 1308, when he was released on giving security for good behaviour, and there is reason to believe he then entered the English service.

The earliest mention of Edward de Brus, the Earl of Carrick's brother, occurs in this campaign. His name appears in the roll of the Prince of Wales's army on April 6, 1304. It is not clear who "Monsieur Guillem de Breouse" was, whose name is included in the list of English nobility present with King Edward at the siege of Stirling,\* but probably he belonged to one of the collateral branches of the family in the south.

All the fortresses of Scotland were now in English hands, but there was no security as long as Wallace remained at liberty. Extraordinary efforts, therefore, were made to capture him. The sentences of exile on John Comyn, de Lindsay, Graham, and Simon Fraser were remitted, on condition that, among them, they should take Wallace before December 20th; James the Steward, de Soulis, and de Umfraville were warned not to come within the King's power until that should be accomplished.

---

\* Palgrave, 274.

At last, in the summer of 1305, Sir William Wallace\* fell into the hands of his enemies. Popular tradition has covered with infamy the memory of Sir John de Menteith, his friend, for having betrayed him; but Sir John had been since March 20, 1304, governor of the castle and sheriffdom of Dunbarton,† and there is no evidence to connect him with the treachery. If treachery there was, as is far from unlikely, the real traitor was probably one Rawe Raa (Ralf Ray), in whose house in Glasgow, according to a paper in the Arundel collection, Wallace was taken. This Rawe or Ralf may be identified with Ralf de Haliburton, taken prisoner at Stirling, and released on condition of securing Wallace.‡ The same individual is probably referred to as "le vallet qui espia Will de Waleys," and received a reward of forty marks.§ One hundred marks were divided among others who took part in the capture, and Menteith, to whose custody as governor of the district he would be committed, received £151. It is quite possible that Menteith had been, and perhaps remained, a personal friend of Wallace; a fact quite sufficient to attract popular odium to his name, although in receiving the prisoner and delivering him up to justice

\*It is not known when, or at whose hands, Wallace received knighthood, but he is commonly referred to as "Sir William" in contemporary documents. In his indictment at Westminster, however, he is termed simply "Willelmus le Waleys," *i. e.*, William the Welshman.

† Bain, ii., 384.

‡ *Ibid.*, 448. His name appears erased in the list of prisoners.

§ Palgrave, 295.

he was doing no more than his plain duty as King Edward's officer.

The trial, for which the commission was issued on August 18th, was hurried through with indecent haste. The prisoner arrived in London on August 22, 1305, and was lodged in the house of one William de Leyre, in Fenchurch parish. Next day he was taken on horseback to Westminster, accompanied by the mayor, sheriffs, aldermen, and others, and brought before his judges in the great hall. There he was set on the south bench, crowned with laurel in mockery, "forasmuch as it was commonly reported that he had said in times past that he ought to wear a crown in that hall." \* On being arraigned as a traitor by Sir Peter Malory, the King's Justiciary, he protested that he was no traitor to the King of England, in that he had never sworn fealty to him. True as this plea undoubtedly was, it could hardly be considered relevant by those who admitted and supported Edward's claim as rightful King of Scotland by conquest; inasmuch as Wallace, they argued, was none the less a rebel because, being a Scotchman, he had refused to swear fealty. He was, therefore, convicted of treason, as well as sacrilege, homicide, robbery, and arson, and sentenced to be drawn from Westminster to the Tower, from the Tower to Aldgate, and so to Smithfield, where he should be hanged. All this was carried out on the same day. As a homicide and robber he was hanged; as an outlaw he was beheaded; for his "enormous villany, done to God and Holy Church

---

\* Stow's *Chronicle*.

in burning churches and vessels containing the body of Christ and relics of the saints," his entrails were taken out and burnt; as a traitor, his head was fixed on London Bridge, and his quarters suspended on gibbets at Newcastle-on-Tyne, Berwick, Stirling, and Perth. For it was held by mediæval statesmen that the majesty of the law could not be defended by simple death; multiple and carefully classified indignity was decreed in this world to every mortal organ of the offender, while ecclesiastics might be trusted to chase the spirit into everlasting torments in the next.

Authentic particulars relating to Wallace's brief career are so exceedingly scanty, that the inventory of papers found with him when he was taken assumes an interest it might not otherwise possess, especially as the papers themselves have not been preserved. They consisted of letters of safe-conduct from King Haco of Norway, King Philip of France, and John de Balliol, with the confederations and ordinances made between Wallace and the magnates of Scotland.







The Earl of Gloucester.



Sir Roger de Kirkpatrick.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE REVOLT OF ROBERT DE BRUS.

A.D. 1304-1306.

**I**T is now necessary to revert to the summer of 1304, when King Edward was besieging Stirling Castle.

On June 11th, at the very time when the Earl of Carrick was receiving the King's thanks for his services, doing fealty for his heritage, and having his debts remitted, he was in conference at Cambuskenneth Abbey with William de Lamberton, Bishop of St. Andrews. A secret bond was concluded between them, whereby it was agreed, "in view of future dangers," that they should in all time coming assist each other against all persons whatsoever; that neither should undertake any business without consulting the other, and that each should warn the other of any approaching danger.\*

This agreement with de Lamberton had such far-reaching consequences, that this is a convenient

---

\* Palgrave, 323.

moment to tabulate the public acts of Robert de Brus up to the time of Wallace's execution. In the cold light of official records and correspondence, they present an appearance somewhat different from that given to them in what has often passed for history.

1296. August 28 : the Earl of Carrick, 22 years of age, does fealty to Edward I. at Berwick, his father, the Lord of Annandale, being the King's governor of Carlisle.
1297. Renews his fealty at Carlisle and raids the lands of Douglas. Afterwards joins the insurgent Scots, but capitulates at Irvine, July 9, giving his daughter Marjorie as hostage for his loyalty to Edward. On November 14 he is received to the King's peace.
1298. July 3 : being in the King's service in Galloway, he writes to the English chancellor.
1299. Is elected one of three Guardians of Scotland in the name of King John. Attacks Edward's garrison in Lochmaben Castle in the same month.  
November 13 : he and the other Guardians, besieging Stirling Castle, write to King Edward, offering to desist from hostilities on the mediation of the King of France.
1302. February 6 : King Edward pardons a murderer on the intercession of the Earl of Carrick, who is, at the same time, appealing for aid to the King of France.  
April 28 : comes with his tenants into the King's peace.  
October : attends King Edward's Parliament.
1303. April : receives orders from the King to attend muster at Roxburgh, with forces from Galloway.  
July 14 : receives advance of pay from King Edward.  
December : has been appointed King Edward's sheriff of Lanark.
1304. January : is King Edward's constable of Ayr Castle.  
March 3 : receives King Edward's thanks for good service. Attends the King's Parliament at St. Andrews.  
April : his father being dead, he goes to London to look after his succession and corresponds with the King. On the

13th he receives King Edward's thanks for forwarding engines for the siege of Stirling.

June 11 : concludes secret treaty with the Bishop of St. Andrews *against all men* ; is served heir to English estates on the 14th, does homage for the same on the 17th, and his debts to the King are respited.

1305. March 20 : is with King Edward at Westminster ; petitions the King to give him de Umfraville's lands in Carrick, which is granted.

Attends Edward's Parliament in Lent.

August : is probably a witness of the trial and execution of Wallace.

September 15 : is ordered by the King to appoint a keeper of Kildrummie Castle.

It is, in truth, a humiliating record, and it requires all the lustre of de Brus's subsequent achievement to efface the ugly details of it.

Having crushed his great enemy in Scotland, King Edward proceeded in September, 1305, to carry out his scheme for the government of that country, which he had already submitted to Parliament in spring. He had then caused the Bishop of Glasgow, the Earl of Carrick, Sir John de Segrave, his Lieutenant in the Lothians, and Sir John de Sandale, Chamberlain of Scotland, to announce that the Scots should elect a certain number of representatives to the Parliament he was about to hold at Westminster in July. This Parliament, however, had been prorogued till the autumn, when the following ten Scottish commissioners, chosen at a conference at Perth, attended : the Bishops of St. Andrews and Dunkeld, the Abbots of Cupar and Melrose, the Earl of Buchan, Sir John de Moubray, Sir Robert de Keith, Sir Adam de Gordon, Sir John de Inchmar-

tin, and Sir John de Menteith, the last named being appointed, by the King's command, in place of Patrick, Earl of March, who, though elected, did not attend. To these commissioners Parliament added twenty-two Englishmen,\* and together they drew up a constitution, of which the chief provisions were to the following effect :

1. Sir John de Bretaine (Brittany), King Edward's nephew, to be the King's Lieutenant and Warden of Scotland ; Sir William de Bevercotes, Chancellor ; Sir John de Sandale, Chamberlain ; and Sir Robert Heron, Controller.

2. Four pairs of Justiciaries to preside respectively over Lothian, over Galloway, over the district between the Forth and the mountains, and over the district beyond the mountains.

3. Sheriffs to be appointed over every county, natives of either Scotland or England, the most sufficient men and profitable for the King and people, and for the maintenance of peace.

4. The Lieutenant, Chancellor, and Chamberlain to appoint coroners in room of those who should be found unfit, unless these held by charter, in which case the King's pleasure to be taken.

5. Provision for the safe custody of the castles of Roxburgh, Jedburgh, Edinburgh, Linlithgow, Stirling, and Dunbarton.

6. The customs of the Scots and Brets† to be prohibited and disused. The Lieutenant, on his com-

---

\* Bain, ii., 457.

† Including the ordeal by battle in criminal cases, and the law of tanistry in cases of succession to landed property.

ing, to assemble the good people \* of Scotland in a convenient place, and there rehearse to them the laws of King David, as subsequently amended ; such laws as should be found plainly against God and reason to be amended by the Lieutenant and his council. Such matters as the Lieutenant might feel unable to deal with in so short a time, to be put in writing by certain commissioners elected by the community, with power to confer with the King and finally determine the matter.

7. The Lieutenant to have power, with the advice of the good people of Scotland, to remove *en corteise manere* such persons as were likely to disturb the peace, and the King might command such to remain south of the Trent.

8. Sir Alexander de Lindsay to remain six months out of Scotland.

9. The Earl of Carrick to place Kildrummie Castle in the keeping of one for whom he shall answer.

10. Sir Simon Fraser to attend the King before December 20th, and to go into exile from England and France for four years—subject to the King's recall at pleasure.

Then followed the form of oath to be taken by the commissioners of both nations, binding them by our Lord's body, the holy relics, and the gospels, to give good advice for maintaining the peace, especially in

\* The term *probi homines* then bore a different meaning to that which it came to have in later times. It meant the vassals, *i. e.*, men holding land of a subject-superior. The more modern equivalent phrase was "lairds."

Scotland; to reveal loyally any hindrance they might know to the good government of Scotland; to suggest amendments in any law and usage dangerous to the peace of that country; neither for hatred, affinity, or other matter, oath, or alliance heretofore made, to withhold counsel to their utmost knowledge and power; to preserve absolute secrecy as to proceedings in council; to declare the names of any persons in Scotland whose residence there might be dangerous to peace; and in all things to advise what was best for the King's honour and the welfare of his lieges.

With this oath fresh on his lips, the Bishop of St. Andrews, one of the Scottish commissioners, accompanied by the Earl of Carrick, who was one of those charged to administer the oath,\* went to Scotland to discharge his sworn duty.

The constitution secured by the convention of Westminster must be considered exceedingly liberal according to the doctrines of that time, and as conferred on a conquered country. It must be regarded as an earnest desire of Edward's to govern Scotland as generously as England, with which he so ardently desired to see it incorporated. It is true that the term "community" was restricted to mean owners of land, but that was the extreme sense it ever could bear under a feudal monarchy. Scotland, in spite of the enormous sums it had cost to subdue her, in spite too of the provocation her conqueror had endured by reason of the repeated perjury of her barons, was to receive equal rights with loyal Eng-

---

\* Bain, ii., 457.

land ; and England was to receive no indemnity for her expenditure of money and lives. Edward had vindicated the authority which he believed to be his "by the grace of God," by the frightful massacre at Berwick, by the exile or imprisonment of rebellious barons, and by the execution of Wallace. He was now going to try the effect of clemency, and no doubt he felt that the Scottish question was at length laid to rest. The lands of de Umfraville, de Seton, William de Balliol, and other lords, lately insurgent, were restored to them on their doing fresh fealty and homage.\* Orders were issued to the sheriffs of English counties, to the effect that, whereas the King desired that Scottish prelates, nobles, and others should be honourably and courteously treated on their journeys to and fro, any one using threats or contumelious words towards them, or refusing to sell victuals to them, should be forthwith imprisoned.† Everything possible was done to let bygones be bygones, and to unite the kingdoms in sentiment, as well as by law.

But the fair prospect was shattered early in 1306 by terrible news from the north. John Comyn—the Red Comyn, as he was familiarly called—had fallen by the hand of the Earl of Carrick, and Scotland was once more ablaze.

Unfortunately, in endeavouring to trace the causes which led to this event, we are thrown back on conflicting and untrustworthy information. According to Fordun, the Earl of Carrick had returned from

---

\* Bain, ii., 460.

† *Ibid.*

Scotland and was at King Edward's Court in December or January, 1306. When John Balliol abdicated, and renounced all claim to the throne of Scotland, John Comyn, the Competitor, a son of ex-King John's sister, became nearest heir of the line which Edward's award had declared to be the royal one of Scotland. Comyn the Competitor was dead, but his rights were continued in the person of his son John, the Red. But the Earl of Carrick, in secret connivance with the Bishop of St. Andrews, had resolved to revive his claim as grandson of another competitor; and thus the dispute between the houses of de Balliol and de Brus, which had been laid to rest by the award of Berwick in 1292, broke out afresh, notwithstanding that in the interval Carrick and John Comyn had been colleagues in the guardianship of the realm in name of King John.

Still following Fordun's version, we are told that Carrick made an alternative offer to Comyn: "Support my title to the crown, and you shall have my estates; or give me your estates, and I will support your claim." Comyn, preferring the certainty of solid landed property to the chance of wresting a throne from the iron grasp of the King of England, accepted the lands of de Brus and bound himself to promote his cause. A mutual oath of secrecy was taken; conditions were drawn out and sealed by both knights. But Comyn, setting no more store by the sanctity of an oath than did others whose names are written large in history, informed King Edward of the whole matter; whereupon the King sent for



de Brus and put certain questions to him. Afterwards, Edward, having drunk more wine than was good for him, let out to some of his lords that he meant to put the Earl of Carrick to death. Next, the Earl of Gloucester employed a messenger to deliver to his friend and cousin de Brus, twelve pence and a pair of spurs, which de Brus rightly interpreted into a hint to fly. Other versions of the tale describe how, snow having fallen, de Brus caused his farrier to shoe his horses with the wrong ends of the shoes foremost, a somewhat shallow artifice to delude his pursuers, and started for Scotland, accompanied only by his secretary and a groom. When about to cross the Western Marches, he noticed a foot-passenger of suspicious appearance, whom he stopped and caused to be searched. He was found to be the bearer of letters from John Comyn to King Edward, urging the death or instant imprisonment of the Earl of Carrick. The unlucky messenger was beheaded on the spot; de Brus pressed forward and arrived at his castle of Lochmaben on the seventh day out of London.

It is futile to attempt to sift the true from the false in this story. It is likely enough that Comyn, who must have been aware of de Brus's pretensions, would do his best to bring them to nought, seeing that, if the crown of Scotland were to be disposed of, he himself had the better claim. But there exists one piece of evidence to show that de Brus stood high in Edward's favour up to the very eve of his crime, namely, that on February 8, 1306, the King directed that the scutage, due by de Brus on

succeeding to his father's English estates, should be remitted.\*

Notice must be taken here of a strangely circumstantial story told by Sir Thomas Gray, differing from all other accounts of what led up to the dark tragedy about to be enacted—a story which seems to have been overlooked or intentionally suppressed by all other biographers of Robert de Brus. Gray, writing in his prison in Edinburgh in 1355, states that the said Robert sent his two brothers, Thomas and Nigel, from Lochmaben to Dalswinton, where John Comyn was living, to invite him to meet Robert at the Grey Friars church in Dumfries. Thomas and Nigel had instructions from their brother to ride with Comyn, and to set upon him by the way and kill him; but they were so hospitably and courteously received by Comyn that they had not the heart to do him any violence. They induced him, however, to ride with them to Dumfries, where they found Robert waiting.

“John Comyn,” they explained, “made us so welcome and gave us such handsome gifts, and showed us such an open countenance, that we could by no means do him any injury.”

“Indeed!” replied Robert, “then let me meet him.”

Then, affirms this writer, Comyn and Bruce met before the altar, and Bruce made the proposal referred to by Fordun, that one of them should surrender his lands to the other, receiving in return his support in seizing the crown of Scotland.

---

\* Bain, ii., 471.

Comyn replied that he would never be false to his fealty to the King of England.


"No?" retorted Robert; "I had other hopes of you, because of the promises made by yourself and your friends. But as you will not fulfil my will in life, you shall have your guerdon!" and with these words he struck the fatal blow.

We have here two accounts, one from a Scottish, the other from an English, point of view. They are not contradictory, although different in the details. Whatever may have been the immediate cause or the order of events, there can be no doubt about the fact that, on February 10th, de Brus came to Dumfries, where the Red Comyn was. The two barons met, either by arrangement or by chance, in the church of the Minorite friars, and engaged in conversation before the high altar. High words passed between them; de Brus drew his dagger, stabbed Comyn, and hurried out of the church. At the door he met his attendants,\* Kirkpatrick and de Lindsay, who, noting his agitation, asked how it was with him. "Ill," replied de Brus, "for I doubt I have slain the Comyn." "You doubt!" cried Kirkpatrick, "then I'll mak siccar";† and, rushing into the church, plunged his dagger into the wounded knight's breast. Sir Robert Comyn (not Sir Edmund,

---

\* According to Hailes, Gospatrick de Kirkpatrick; but local tradition makes it Kirkpatrick of Closeburn. This is confirmed by heraldic authority, for the crest of this family is a hand holding a dagger, distilling drops of blood, with the motto, "I make sure."

† "I'll make sure." It should be noted that Kirkpatrick, like other feudal Knights, probably spoke Norman French, certainly not lowland Scots.



DUMFRIES.  
*(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)*



as Barbour has it), uncle of the Red Comyn, was also slain in trying to defend his nephew.\*

Bruce, it is believed, returned to Lochmaben, but not to linger in such a perilous neighbourhood. The Comyns were much more puissant than he in the southwest; so, having sent out letters to summon his friends, he rode straight to Glasgow, where he was received with open arms by Bishop Wishart. This good prelate, notwithstanding that he had on six different occasions solemnly sworn fealty to Edward,† not only pronounced absolution on Bruce for the murder, but caused coronation robes to be prepared for him in the episcopal wardrobe. These robes, together with a banner of the King of Scotland, which he had long kept concealed in his treasury, he sent to the abbey of Scone, in preparation for an event on which he had set his heart.

This event, the coronation of Robert de Brus, took place on March 29, 1306. It was the hereditary privilege of the Macduffs, Earls of Fife, to place the crown on a new King's head; but Duncan, the earl of that day, was in the English interest. Whereupon there befell something strange and least ex-

\* Barbour says that many others were slain at the same time—

“ Schir Edmund Cumyn als was slane,  
And othir mony of mekill mane,”

but of this confirmation is lacking. Of the church of Greyfriars, where this tragedy was enacted, a fragment remained till after 1867, built into the premises of a public house in Friar's Vennel; but this has since been pulled down, and no trace of the church now remains, except in the name of the street.

† Palgrave, clxxx. and 346.

pected, for Macduff's sister, Isabella, Countess of Buchan, appeared to assert the privilege of her house, notwithstanding that, as the wife of a Comyn, she was thereby doing honour to him who had slain her husband's near kinsman.\*

The names of others who bore a part in this great crisis in Scottish history, and were present at the coronation, have been recorded. They were: the Bishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow; the Abbot of Scone; de Brus's four brothers, Edward, Nigel, Thomas, and Alexander, and his nephew, Thomas Randolph of Strathdon; † his brother-in-law, Christopher de Seton; Malcolm, Earl of Lennox; John, Earl of Athol; James de Douglas; Gilbert de la Haye of Errol, and his brother Hugh; David Barclay of Cairns; Alexander, brother of Sir Simon Fraser; Walter de Somerville of Carnwath; David of Inchmartin; Robert Boyd, ‡ and Robert Fleming. § Some of these knights were to pay dearly for their share in that day's proceedings.

The news of this fresh outbreak and of the double murder at Dumfries fell on King Edward like a bolt from the blue. He was at Itchenstoke, in Hampshire, when the tidings reached him, and, with his usual prompt vigour, he issued immediate orders to

---

\* A year later, March 20, 1307, Edward I., at the request of his Queen Margaret, granted pardon to Geoffrey de Coigners for concealing the coronet of gold with which Robert de Brus was crowned.

† Afterwards Earl of Moray. He is popularly known as Randolph, but in truth his real designation was Thomas the son of Randolph or Ralph.

‡ Ancestor of the Viscounts Kilmarnock.

§ Ancestor of the Earls of Wigtown.

prepare for a campaign in the north. Sir Aymer de Valence\* was appointed his lieutenant and commander of the forces, with power to receive the "middling" men of Scotland to the King's peace. But none who were present at, or privy to, the slaying of the Comyns, nor any of the rebellious lords, were to be dealt with without first taking the King's pleasure.† De Brus's castle of Lochmaben, as well as all his lands in Annandale, were forfeited and bestowed on King Edward's son-in-law, Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex; his Durham estate of Hert on Sir Robert de Clifford; his lands at Tottenham, in Middlesex, to Walter de Bedewynde, and the rest of de Brus's English possessions to other knights. Thus the King of Scots began his reign a landless adventurer. Even his title was taken from him by the King to whom he had done homage for it; for Henry de Percy was made Earl of Carrick in his stead. The earldom of Menteith was given to John and Edmund de Hastings, and that of Lennox to Sir John de Menteith, the captor of Wallace.

Age and increasing infirmity were telling sorely on King Edward's bodily power, but his fiery spirit burns as fiercely as ever in the numerous writs and letters which he directed in the spring of 1306. On May 24th, he wrote from Westminster to Aymer de Valence, telling him that he is sending Prince Ed-

\* This renowned knight was at this time about twenty-six years of age. Though he succeeded his father as Earl of Pembroke about 1296, he does not appear officially under that title until 1307.

† Bain, ii., 473.



ward to the north with a large army, but that some exploit must be done on the Scots before his arrival. Two days later the King wrote again, urging, above all things, that the Bishops of Glasgow and St. Andrews should be captured, and that on no account were any terms to be offered them. The Bishop of Glasgow was taken at Cupar; and Edward wrote to de Valence from Margate expressing his delight, but charging him to secure Bishop de Lamberton, who, he was informed, was at the bottom of the whole mischief. Letters passed almost daily, sometimes more than one in a day, from the King to his "beau cosin," all of them betraying his burning impatience to be avenged on the rebels. Among others, Sir Michael de Wymes (Wemyss) was pointed out as especially obnoxious, and de Valence was commanded to burn, to destroy, and strip the lands of that knight and raze his house "where we lay," as the King had found neither good speech nor good service in him. The same, or "worse if possible," was to be done to the lands of Sir Gilbert de la Haye, to whom the King had done great courtesy when in London, but now found that he was a traitor.

An important letter was written on June 28th from Stoke Goldington, in which the King, referring to his previous orders to put to death all enemies and rebels already or hereafter taken, commanded de Valence, if he takes the Earl of Carrick, the Earl of Athol, or Sir Simon Fraser, to keep them in safe ward till his own pleasure should be known.

On June 5, 1306, the dread sentence of the greater excommunication was passed on Sir Robert de Brus

and three other knights. It was pronounced in St. Paul's Cathedral by the Archdeacons of Middlesex and Colchester—*candelis accensis et extinctis*—with candles first lighted, and then solemnly extinguished.\*

Edward was suffering from severe dysentery, which prevented his intended journey north. Aymer de Valence, however, succeeded in dealing what seemed a final blow to King Robert's cause. Having his headquarters at Perth, de Valence lay waiting attack by the King of Scots. Bruce, with such force as he had been able to collect, was in the woods near Methven. Hither came de Valence in search of him, on Sunday, June 26th, with a force, says Barbour, outnumbering Bruce's by 1500, chiefly composed of Scotsmen, and far better equipped and trained than their opponents. Bruce was taken by surprise, but the roughness of the ground favoured him, and his men stood briskly to arms. A fierce hand-to-hand fight took place, in which the King of Scots was unhorsed by Sir Philip de Moubray, and rescued by de Seton. His men fell into confusion and dispersed through the wood. Hugh de la Haye, Barclay, Fraser, Inchmartin, de Somerville, and Thomas Randolph were taken prisoners; the King himself, narrowly escaping, galloped from the field with his brother Edward, Athol, James Douglas, Gilbert de la Haye, and Nigel Campbell.

As Robert Wischard or Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow, disappeared from public life after his capture at Cupar in 1306, this seems a fitting place to mention his subsequent fate, and to estimate his merits and the value of the part he played in active politics.

---

\* *Annales Londinenses*, i., 147.

He remained a close prisoner in England till his release after the battle of Bannockburn in 1314. He was then quite blind, and survived his captivity only for two years. Though it is impossible to reconcile his frequent changes, his repeated perjuries and breaches of sworn allegiance to King Edward, with ordinary rules of integrity, yet his unvarying devotion to Bruce has secured him in the affectionate remembrance of his countrymen. His severest critic cannot allege that he ever calculated which side was likely to win. When Balliol renounced his allegiance to Edward, Wishart must have foreseen the hopelessness of resisting the power of England; yet he did resist it, in season and out of season, from the pulpit and from the saddle of his charger. When Bruce came to him, a solitary fugitive from justice, the warm-hearted prelate gave him absolution, and hastened to prepare for his coronation. In his eyes, all means were justifiable to secure the independence of his country. He even used the timber which King Edward gave for a new belfry to Glasgow Cathedral to make engines of war against the castles held by the English.

His deep love for the Bruce was fully returned, and King Robert gave passing expression to it in a charter of lands granted to the bishopric during Wishart's captivity, dated April 26, 1309.

"We feel in the depth of our heart the imprisonment and chains, the persecution and duress, which the venerable father, Lord Robert, by the grace of God Bishop of Glasgow, has hitherto endured and still patiently endures, for the rights of the Church and our kingdom of Scotland."



Sir John de St. John.



Murdoch of Cumloden.

## CHAPTER VII.

### ADVENTURES OF THE KING OF SCOTS.

A.D. 1306–1307.

THE King of Scots and his companions wandered among the Highland hills for some weeks before venturing to the neighbourhood of Aberdeen. Here Robert was joined by his queen, his daughter Marjorie, and his two sisters. Thence they betook themselves to the west country, enduring great privations. Douglas is mentioned as their chief purveyor.


“ But worthy James of Douglas  
 Ay travailland and besy was  
 For to purchas the ladyis met,\*  
 And it on many wis wald get.  
 For quhile † he venesoun tham brocht,  
 And with his handis quhile he wrocht  
 Gynnys ‡ to tak geddis § and salmounis,  
 Troutis, elis and als menounis.” ¶

\* Meat. † Sometimes. ‡ Snares. § Pike. ¶ Eels and also minnows.—*The Brus*, xvii.

In this way they came to the borders of Lorn. The Macdoualls of Lorn were of the same blood as those of that name in Galloway—sworn enemies of Bruce. Moreover, Alexander of Argyle had married an aunt of the murdered Comyn, thus the King was here in great peril. At a place still called Dalry—the King's field—a combat took place, in which Bruce's party, greatly outnumbered, were badly worsted, Douglas and de la Haye both being wounded.\* The King himself was in great peril at the hands of three brothers called Macandrosser, or sons of the door-keeper, who attacked him as he was riding along a strip of narrow ground between a lake and a steep hill. One of them seized the King's bridle, but his arm was shorn from the shoulder by a sweep of Robert's battle-axe. The second seized the stirrup, but the King set spurs to his horse, pressing his foot so heavily on the fellow's hand that he was dragged along the ground, and the King slew him, having first disposed of the third brother, who attempted to spring up behind the saddle. Afterwards, King Robert managed to cover the retreat of the ladies, whom he sent under escort of his brother Nigel and the Earl of Athol to the fancied security of Kildrummie, the royal castle in Aberdeenshire, which, it will be remembered, Edward had committed to his keeping. Many years were to roll by—many heads were to be laid low—before the King and Queen of Scots were to meet again.

---

\* Barbour's narrative is here confirmed by a letter from King Edward to the Prince of Wales, September 14th, heartily acknowledging John of Lorn's services at this time.—Bain, ii., 490.



KILDRUMMIE CASTLE.

*(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)*



The Prince of Wales left his father near the Border and entered Scotland at the head of a powerful army. On July 11th, he received the unconditional surrender of King Robert's castle of Lochmaben, passed northward, and before September 13th had taken Kildrummie.\* It is the tradition of that neighbourhood that the fall of this stronghold was hastened by treachery. Some one set fire to the forage stored in the chapel of the castle, and in the confusion the English were admitted. The Scottish queen and princesses, dreading the rigours of a siege, had, on the approach of the English army, sought sanctuary in St. Duthac's chapel at Tain; but it availed them nothing, for the Earl of Ross seized them and handed them over to the English. Nigel de Brus was taken at Kildrummie, with Sir Alexander de Lindsay and Sir Robert Boyd. Nigel was sent for trial to Berwick, and was there executed as a traitor.

As for the ladies, singular directions were given for the security of three of them. The Earl of Buchan, it is said, wished to kill his Countess for the affront she had put on him by crowning King Robert; but this Edward would not allow. He gave orders that she, the Princess Marjorie, and Marie de Brus should be confined in cages; which was literally carried out. But this was not quite such a barbarous punishment as it sounds, for English waiting-women were provided to attend on the ladies, and the "kages," which were to be constructed inside turrets of the castles of Roxburgh and Ber-

---

\* Bain, 480.



wick and the Tower of London, were to be made of wooden lattice strengthened with iron, and furnished like a comfortable chamber (*et q la kage soit ensi fait q la Contesse y eit essement de chambre cortoise*).<sup>\*</sup> The Queen was to be imprisoned at Brustewick. Two waiting-women "advanced in years and not gay," two valets, and a foot page were appointed by King Edward's command, "sober and not riotous, to make her bed, and for other things necessary for the comfort of her chamber."

Sir Simon Fraser was executed in London on September 6th, according to the ferocious manner prescribed by the Norman law against high treason. First he was hung, then taken down alive from the gallows and his entrails torn out and burned before his eyes. Next he was beheaded, the body was hung up again, and the head was taken, with trumpets sounding, to London Bridge and there fixed up. On the 27th, the body and the gallows were taken down and burnt together by special orders of the King.† The Earl of Athol, who had been taken in attempting to escape by sea, suffered in the same way on October 29th, but inasmuch as he was cousin of the King of England, his gibbet was made thirty feet higher than Fraser's. The chronicler of the *Flores* complacently dwells on the details of his death, which, he says, were arranged *ut majores cruciatus sentiret*—that he might endure the greater torment.

Sir Christopher de Seton was hanged at Dumfries, his brother Sir Alexander at Newcastle. It was in-

<sup>\*</sup> Palgrave, 358.

† *Annales Londinenses*, i., 149.

deed a bloody gaol-delivery at the last-named town. Besides Sir Alexander, fifteen prisoners, including two knights, Sir David de Inchmartin and Sir John de Cambo, were summarily hanged, the King's injunctions being stern and strict that none of them were to be allowed a trial.\* Among these victims was Alexander le Skyrmyshour,† whom Wallace had appointed hereditary standard-bearer of Scotland, and John de Seton, an Englishman, who, immediately after Comyn's murder, had captured Sir Richard de Siward's new castle of Tibbers‡ and made prisoner Sir Richard, the Sheriff of Dumfriesshire.

The extant record of this wholesale execution at Newcastle enables us to correct Barbour's narrative, which places the fall of Kildrummie a year later, and puts the sentence on the prisoners into the lips of the dying Edward.

Powerful as he was in vengeance, the King of England dared not violate benefit of clergy by taking the lives of the Bishops of Glasgow and St. Andrews and the Abbot of Scone, who fell into his hands during the summer of 1306. To do so would have been an act of sacrilege, and though they were put in irons and sent to English prisons, all the incensed King could do further was to draw up a charge of perjury and rebellion against them, and lay it before the Pope.§ Nothing illustrates more

\* Bain, ii., 485.

† Original form of the surname Scrymgeour, pronounced Scrimmager in Scots.

‡ So named from a very deep well within it, in Gaelic *tiobar*. It now stands a ruin in Drumlanrig Park.

§ Palgrave, 328-330.

forcibly the peculiar social and political relations of the Church and State at this time. Here were these feudal prelates, as much at home in mail and salade as in cope and mitre—in the knightly saddle as in the episcopal chair. As swift to shed blood as to administer the sacraments, they were almost as well practised in the firing of homesteads as in the swinging of censers. Their immunities were shared by no lay subjects. The ægis of St. Peter protected them from civil process; not the monarch himself could impeach them for high treason: they bowed only to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome; and it is part of the irony of history that a fuller record remains of their violence and intrigue, than of the peaceful discharge of their pastoral work.

Still, Edward panted to have all the Scottish bishops in his power, and wrote impatiently from Lancaster on August 11th, asking why de Valence could not send him word of the Bishop of Moray's taking. That prelate had fled betimes to the Court of King Haco of Norway, from whom Edward tried in vain to obtain his surrender. Bruce's nephew, Thomas Randolph, of whom we are to hear much in years to come, was pardoned on doing fresh fealty to Edward; and the nephew of Bruce's first wife, the young Earl of Mar, though kept in prison, was not put in irons because of his tender years. James the Steward did homage to the King of England at Lanercost on October 23d.

To follow the fortunes of King Robert, now embarked on the most perilous and adventurous period of his life, we may safely entrust ourselves to the

guidance of Barbour; checking, from time to time, his details and exact chronology by reference to official records. Plenty of miraculous and impossible incidents wove themselves into the story of the restorer of Scottish monarchy under the hands of later writers, but none of these can be traced to Barbour's authority.

After parting with his Queen and the other ladies, Bruce turned westward again on foot, with Sir James Douglas and about two hundred followers, intending to seek shelter in one of the islands. Nigel Campbell was sent forward to the coast to try and secure shipping. The King, following a few days later, came to the shores of Loch Lomond, where boat there was none to be seen. To go round either end of the lake would have led them into the perilous neighbourhood of John of Lorn on the one hand, or Sir John de Menteith on the other. At last, Douglas, carefully examining the shore, found a little sunken boat, which they managed to make fairly seaworthy. It would, however, only carry three men at a time, and a whole night and day were spent in ferrying the party across. Some of the hardy hill men swam over with their arms and clothes tied on their heads. To pass away the time while the crossing was being effected we are told that King Robert read aloud to his companions the romance of Ferambras and Oliver.

Malcolm, Earl of Lennox, was made aware one day that there were poachers afoot in his forest after the deer. He went out in pursuit of them, but great was his delight to find that it was the King of Scots,


for he was devoted to his cause. This encounter probably saved the lives, or at least the liberty, of the whole party; for they were hard pressed for food, winter was approaching, and they dared not leave the hills, except by sea. Lennox fed and lodged the wanderers, a timely aid, which King Robert did not forget in brighter days.\*

Nevertheless, the borders of Lorn and Menteith were no safe resting-place for the Bruce. Nigel Campbell had managed to secure some vessels, in which the King and his party embarked somewhere on the Clyde near Dunbarton and sailed for Cantyre. Lennox meant to have sailed with them, but his galley was delayed behind the others, and fell in with the galleys of Lorn. He was hotly pursued, and only escaped capture by throwing overboard all his baggage.

Angus of the Isles received the King and his men at Dunaverty Castle in Cantyre,† and entertained them right hospitably. Luckily, however, Bruce did not tarry long with him, but sailed on the third day about three hundred men in all, for Rachrin (now Rathlin), an island off the Irish coast, about fourteen miles south-west of the Mull of Cantyre. They were only just in time, for Lorn had tracked them

\* In gratitude for this service, King Robert, after Bannockburn, granted Lennox the privilege of sanctuary for three miles by land and water round Luss church, on Loch Lomond.

† This castle has wholly disappeared. It was the scene of a horrible massacre in the 17th century, when General Leslie, of the Covenanters' army, slaughtered the garrison of 300 brave Highlanders in cold blood.



"THE ROCK OF BLOOD." SITE OF THE CASTLE OF DUNAVERTY.  
(From a photograph by *Valentine Bros., Dundee.*)



out. On September 22d Dunaverty was closely invested, and King Edward was hurrying forward miners and provisions for the siege.\*

It is exceedingly difficult to understand how King Robert, as Barbour affirms and as most people believe, managed to spend the whole of the winter of 1306-7 in Rachrin. That little island was part of the territory of Bysset of the Glens of Antrim, a trusted officer of England. That Bruce was known by the government to have gone to the islands, is clear from the orders sent by King Edward to Hugh Bysset in January, 1307, by which he was directed to join Sir John de Menteith and Sir Simon de Montacute with a fleet, "to put down Robert de Brus and destroy his retreat in the isles between Scotland and Ireland."† On the other hand, if, as Fabyan and other English writers report, the King of Scots took refuge during this winter in Norway, it is very unlikely that Barbour should not have heard of it, and even less likely that he should suppress such a romantic episode. Neither is it likely that Bruce, had he gone to Norway, would have chosen for his return to Scotland a moment when his cause seemed utterly broken; when his friends, the Earl of Menteith, Sir Patrick Graham, and others had surrendered to Edward,‡ and the coast was swarming with English and Highland galleys in search of him.

On the whole, it seems safer to accept the circum-

---

\* Bain, ii., p. 491.

† *Ibid.*, 502.

‡ *Ibid.*, 495.



stantial statement of Barbour. He says that Douglas, fretting at being mewed up in Rachrin, and pitying the poor islanders who had to maintain so large a party, obtained the King's leave to make a reconnaissance in Arran. Taking with him Sir Robert Boyd, he crossed to Cantyre, and, making his crew row under the land by night, landed at daybreak in Arran. The galley was drawn ashore; the oars and tackle were hidden, and, wet, weary, and hungry, the party crept at daybreak into ambush near Brodick Castle.

This fortress was in the keeping of Sir John de Hastings, who had a number of guests with him. Three vessels, laden with stores of clothing, arms, wine, and victual for the castle, had arrived overnight and lay in the bay. Douglas from his hiding-place watched them discharging their cargo, till, choosing a moment when the garrison and sailors were toiling up to the castle laden with stores, he rushed upon them with his men, slew some, put the rest to flight, and seized the spoil. Strange to say, those within the castle did not venture to the rescue of their comrades, but closed the gates, and allowed Douglas to get clear off with his booty. Needless to say how welcome were the supplies of arms, food, and clothing secured in this lucky exploit.

Douglas must have sent word of his success to the King, and advised him to come to Arran; for in ten days' time Bruce arrived with thirty-three small galleys. A woman led him to the mouth of "ane woddy glen," where Douglas and his band harboured. The King blew his horn.

"That is the King!" cried Douglas, "I know his blast of old."

Again the forest echoed to the notes, and a third time.

"No fear but that is the King!" said Boyd; and once more the devoted band stood together.

Those who know the beautiful isle of Arran must be aware how greatly pleasanter and more secure was the refuge it afforded to the outlawed King than bleak and wind-swept Rachrin. Nearly twenty miles long, and rising into mountains nearly 3000 feet high, its glens and corries, at that time densely clothed with forest, might have enabled the fugitives to set their pursuers at defiance for an indefinite time. But neither the Bruce nor the Black Douglas were of the mould to accept life under such conditions. The King had no tidings of the fate of his wife and child; perhaps he knew the stern Edward well enough to fear the worst. Five and twenty miles to the south-east lay his own earldom of Carrick. From his post in Arran hills he could trace the familiar outlines of the coast round his birth-place at Turnberry; nay, on clear days he might make out the smoke rising out of his own chimneys.

He resolved to send a spy to find out how matters were faring over there, and whether there was any good-will among the people for their absent lord. Accordingly, on a day in early spring, one Cuthbert set out to gather intelligence. If he found the people well disposed and the country fairly safe, he was to kindle a fire on Turnberry Head at an appointed hour.

Cuthbert found everything as bad as could be. Henry de Percy lay in Bruce's own house of Turnberry, with a garrison of three hundred; English troops swarmed in all parts of the land, and, worst of all, the people were, some indifferent, others ill-disposed, to the cause of Bruce. So Cuthbert lit no fire.

Somebody else did, though, for it was the season of "muirburn," as they still call it in Scotland, when farmers burn the heather and gorse on their pastures. A chance blaze near Turnberry at the appointed hour deceived King Robert, who at once commanded his men to launch the galleys, and they rowed all night, steering for the fire. Landing before daybreak near Turnberry, they were met by the faithful Cuthbert, for he too had seen the light, and, distracted with fear lest thereby the King should be lured to his undoing, lay on the shore to warn him of his danger.

A council of war was held. Matters were, in truth, at a critical pass. Edward de Brus vowed he had had enough sea-faring, and, come what might, he would risk his fortune on land. Three hundred hungry desperadoes need little persuasion to action. It was still dark, and all was silent in the hamlet surrounding the castle. Bruce led his men along the causeway he knew so well. Not a scabbard rattled; the Highlanders, shod in deerskin brogues, moved as noiselessly as wildcats. Some of Percy's men lay outside the castle, in the cottages, but none stirred till, with a wild war-cry, the Bruce was upon them. The Englishmen were cut down as they struggled

from their slumbers. Percy within his keep, heard the din of slaying, yet dared not come out in the dark, not knowing what was the strength of the enemy. The King, having collected what spoil and arms could be found, drew off to the hill country.

The exact date of this first success of the King of Scots is not known, but it was in the spring of 1307. Perhaps if we knew all, it would be proved that Bruce was acting in concert with his two brothers Thomas and Alexander, though with far different fortune. They landed from Ireland on February 9th in Loch Ryan, some five and twenty miles south of Turnberry, with Sir Rainald de Crauford and some hundreds of Irish kernes. They were attacked shortly after landing by Dougal Macdouall, a Galloway chief, and their party was cut to pieces. Thomas and Alexander de Brus, having been severely wounded, were taken to Carlisle, with de Crauford also, delivered to King Edward and instantly hanged. Macdouall was richly rewarded, and so were his men; and his son received from Edward the daughter and heiress of Hugh de Chaumpaigne in marriage.\*

Leaving his King in the fastnesses of the Galloway hills, Sir James de Douglas set off with two companions only, to reconnoitre his own estates in Lanarkshire. Coming in disguise to Hazelside, where lived Thomas Dickson, † an old retainer of his father, he was joyfully welcomed and received to hiding. Others were found bearing enough goodwill to the family of Douglas, or enough ill-will to

\* Bain, ii, 506; Palgrave, 318.

† Thomas filius Ricardi.

the English garrison, to join in a plot to seize the castle.

On Palm Sunday the whole garrison paraded for divine service in St. Bride's chapel of Douglas, distant about a mile from the castle. Douglas had caused his confederates to disguise themselves as simple peasants, himself carrying a flail, and they crowded into the chapel after the soldiers. The service was proceeding quietly, when suddenly the roof rang with the slogan, "A Douglas! a Douglas!"—the signal for attack. The English were speedily slaughtered or taken prisoners. The castle had been left in charge of a porter and cook who offered no resistance to the entry of the blood-stained band. Douglas and his men sat down to the dinner prepared for the luckless soldiers; after which, having stripped the building of everything worth taking, they piled the heavy stores and provisions together, staved in the wine casks, beheaded their prisoners, tossed in the corpses of men and horses in ghastly confusion, and set fire to the mass. The castle was burnt to the ground, and Douglas's men betook themselves to the hills to elude pursuit.

This affair took place on March 19, 1307, and, for the reason explained by Barbour, has ever since been remembered as the "Douglas Larder."

" For mele and malt and blud and wyn  
Ran all togidder in a mellyn,  
That was unsemly for to se :  
Tharfor the men of that cuntre,  
For sic thingis thar mellit \* wer,  
Callit it the Douglas lardener."

---

\* Mingled.

In spite of these successful exploits at Turnberry and Douglas, the cause of Bruce was never so desperate as it was in the early months of 1307. He had not an acre of land he could call his own; three of his four brothers, and most of his trusty friends, had perished on the gibbet; of his other supporters, nearly all had given up his service as hopeless, and re-entered that of King Edward; his wife, his daughter, and his sisters were in English prisons.\*

On every side his foes were closing round his hiding-place in Glentool. Four thousand foot from Cumberland, Westmorland, and Lancashire mustered at Carlisle in February and March,† and Edward committed the pursuit to his most famous generals.

Aymer de Valence, Viceroy of Scotland, smarting under reiterated reproaches for want of success and apparent inaction,‡ was concentrating his forces from the north; Sir Henry de Percy guarded the sea-ports on the west; Sir Dougal Macdouall had all his men under arms in Wigtownshire; while on the east Sir John de Botetourte, the Warden, watched the passes of Nithsdale with 70 horse and 200 archers. Sir Robert de Clifford, with Sir John de Wigtoun,

---

\* Edward I. has been so often and so justly charged with cruelty in the Scottish war, that it is but fair to remark that, fierce as he was to offenders of his own sex, he never, with the single exception of the sack of Berwick, permitted violence to be done to women. But for his chivalrous scruples, he might easily have forced the King of Scots to surrender, by threatening the lives of Queen Elizabeth and Princess Marjorie.

† Bain, ii., 506, 508.

‡ *Ibid.*, 504.

guarded the fords of Cree. A special force of 300 Tynedale bowmen, under Sir Geoffrey de Moubray and three captains, was sent to search the recesses of Glentrool; \* while, most formidable of all, John of Lorn was hastening through Ayrshire with 22 men-at-arms and 800 active Highlanders.† The sketch-map of the district, indicating the positions occupied by the forces of Edward, will show how little likely it was that the Bruce could escape their toils.

But it was not only his open foes that the King of Scots had to dread. It was essential that he should collect some troops for his defence, and few besides ruffians and broken men would be attracted to take service with him.‡ Among his recruits there would be sure to be some ready to earn a handsome reward by his assassination or betrayal. Such an one, it seems, Sir Ingelram de Umfraville scrupled not to hire, a one-eyed rogue from Carrick, who wormed his way into Bruce's confidence.

It was the King's practice to rise early, and with-

\* Bain, ii., 508.


† Barbour's singular accuracy is shown here :

“ Johne of Lorne and all his micht  
That had of worthy men and wicht  
With him aucht hundreth men and ma.”

—*The Brus*, lii.

De Valence's warrant is extant to pay John of Lorn for 22 men-at-arms and 800 foot.—Bain, ii., 520.

‡ Barbour's estimate of the numbers with the King in Glentrool is from 150 to 300—much nearer the truth than that of Hemingburgh, who says that Bruce was lurking in the moors with 10,000 foot! The good monk never saw the Galloway hill country, or he might have been puzzled to explain how such a force could be fed there.



### GALLOWAY.

- The King of Scots, with 150-200 men.*
- Sir Aymer de Valence, Guardian of Scotland for King Edward.*
- Sir Henry de Percy, Governor of Ayrshire and Galloway.*
- John of Lorn, with 800 Highlanders.*
- Sir Robert de Clifford & Sir John de Wigtoun.*
- Sir John de Botetourte, with 70 horse and 200 archers.*
- Sir Geoffrey de Moubray, with 500 Tynedale bowmen.*
- Sir Dougal Macdonald, the Celtic chief of West Galloway.*





draw from his men for a space every morning, generally alone, but sometimes accompanied by a page.\* This was well known to the Carrick ruffian, who plotted with his two sons to waylay the King one morning.

Bruce, we are told, had been warned against this man; so when he spied him coming with his sons through the wood to meet him, he was not slow to smell treason, especially as they were all three armed. Turning to his page, who most luckily was with him that day, the King snatched the bow out of his hand and a single arrow, and called on the three to stand. The father affected surprise.

"Bethink you, sire!" he cried, "who should be nearer your person than I?"

The King repeated his command that they should stand where they were, but the one-eyed rascal continued to remonstrate, all the time drawing nearer with his sons. Bruce, a practised hunter, drew bow on him; the arrow pierced his solitary eye. It was the only arrow the page carried, but the King never moved without his sword. With this he clove the skull of one of the sons who rushed on him with a hand-axe, and turned to meet the other who came at him with a spear. With one stroke of his sword Bruce shore the spear-shaft in twain, with another he smote the assassin to the earth.

After this, Douglas rejoined the King, fresh from the raid on his own lands. De Valence now advanced

\* My readers should turn to Canto xlv. of Barbour's poem. It is exceedingly thrilling, though unfortunately all the details are not such as may be repeated by a modern writer.

among the hills, probably by way of Dalmellington and Loch Doon. Bruce, watching his progress from the heights, and retiring before him, nearly fell into the hands of Lorn, who had made a circuit to take him in rear. The King had but three hundred men with him, and, placed as he was between two forces, each greatly larger than his own, it would have been stark madness to show fight. He therefore divided his company into three bands, ordering each to take a different line through the forest, and appointing a place and time for re-assembly.

Now Lorn had brought with him a famous bloodhound, once the property of, and greatly attached to, Bruce. He relied on this dog to settle on the trail of his old master, and he was not disappointed. The hound fastened on the scent of that band which remained with the King, and the pursuit soon became very hot. Bruce directed his followers to scatter and seek safety, each for himself, while he retained with himself none but his foster-brother.

Still the bloodhound stuck to his old master's trail. Lorn, feeling sure he had the right quarry before him, told off five Highlanders, fleet of foot, to run forward. These fellows soon overtook the King. Three of them attacked him, while the other two engaged his attendant. Bruce slew one of his assailants, and, on the others drawing off, turned to help his man, and killed one of the pair that had set upon him. Only three of the five now remained alive. The two Highlanders who had retired before the King came at him again, but he slew them both, while his foster-brother vanquished the fifth.

But the peril was far from past. Lorn's men were drawing near with the sleuth-hound in leash. The King was so greatly exhausted that, descending into a wood, he declared he could go no farther. It was the most critical moment of his whole life. On his foster-brother, did we but know his name, should be bestowed the glory of preserving the monarch—nay, the monarchy itself—of Scotland; for he persuaded the King to make one more effort, otherwise their fates had been sealed.

A stream ran through the wood; the fugitives dropped into it, and, by travelling along its channel for some distance, threw the bloodhound off the scent, and so made good their escape in the forest.\*

After a short rest, the King and his faithful companion resumed their journey. We know not what harbour they had in view, but it is easy to understand that the wood, though broad and thick, would not conceal them long from hundreds of eager hunters. Leaving it, therefore, they passed out on the wide moor, where they met three armed men, one of whom carried a sheep on his shoulders. These greeted the King, and told him they were seeking Robert de Brus.

"If that be so," said the King, "hold your way, and I will soon let you see him."

By his language and bearing the men suspected they were in the presence of the man they sought. But the King was on his guard. He made the three

---

\* Thus Barbour, lii., liii.; but he adds that some gave a different version of the adventure, namely, that the King went on, while the attendant stayed behind and shot the bloodhound with an arrow.

strangers march before him and his foster-brother, till they came to a deserted hut. There the sheep was killed, a fire kindled, and preparations were made for a much-needed meal and night's rest. But the King insisted that he and his comrade should have a separate fire at one end of the hut, to which the strangers consented with a bad grace. The famished fugitives ate their fill of broiled mutton, which made the desire for sleep almost invincible. But for the King and his man to sleep at the same time meant that neither of them should ever waken, for by this time they had little doubt of the intentions of their new acquaintances. Through part of the night they relieved each other in watching, but, so great was their weariness that at last both were overcome with sleep. Bruce, waking suddenly, heard his companion, whose watch it was, snoring soundly, and, at the same time, by the uncertain light of the embers, perceived the three fellows coming towards him from the other fire. He knew there must be mischief afoot, so, rousing his foster-brother with a hearty kick, he sprang to his feet sword in hand.

His companion staggered up, dazed with sleep, only to be struck down mortally wounded. It was three to one now; three fresh men, moreover, against one "*fortravalit*"\*; but such was the King's prowess as a swordsman that all three of his assailants fell before him.

Such, and many others like them, were the daily adventures of the Bruce, as recounted by the

---

\*Wearied, worn out.

admiring Barbour; and it must be left to the judgment of each reader to decide how far they are to be admitted as literal history. Of this much we may be well assured, that Bruce owed his life on more than one occasion to his great activity and skill with weapons, and that none of the "gestis" recorded of him approach more nearly to the miraculous, than the plain fact of his escape from pursuit in Glentrool.

Before returning to the solid ground of authentic history, room must be found for one more legendary episode of this stirring time, which has at least the support of heraldry and place-names.

From the eastern shore of lonely Loch Dee—a sheet of water separated from Loch Trool by a mountainous pass—rises a hill called Craigencallie—the old woman's crag. Here, in a solitary cabin, dwelt a widow, the mother of three sons, each by a different husband, and named Murdoch, MacKie, and MacLurg.\* It was on this hill that the King, when he caused his followers to separate, had told them to re-assemble, and hither he came alone after the loss of his foster-brother.

He asked the old widow for food, of which he stood in sore need. She bade him come in, for that all wayfarers were welcomed for the sake of one.

"And prithee who may that one be?" asked the King.

"I'll tell thee that," quoth the goodwife; "it is none other than King Robert the Bruce, rightful lord

---

\* Barbour mentions only two, but local tradition is positive as to three.

of this land. His foes are pressing him hard now, but the day is at hand when he shall come by his own."

Upon this, the King made himself known, was welcomed into the house, and set down to a good meal. While he was discussing the homely fare, the three sons returned. Their mother made them do obeisance straightway, and they became staunch adherents of King Robert.

The King, so it is said, desired to test their prowess with the bow. The eldest, Murdoch, let fly at two ravens perched on a crag, and transfixing both with the same arrow. MacKie then shot another raven, flying overhead, but MacLurg missed his mark. When the widow's words came to be fulfilled by the King coming to his own, he asked her how he could reward her for her timely succour.

"Just give me," said she, "the wee bit hassock o' land atween Palnure and Penkiln."

Her request was granted, and the "bit hassock" being of considerable extent, about five miles long and three broad, was divided between the three sons. Hence the origin of the families of MacKie of Larg, Murdoch of Cumloden, and MacLurg of Kirouchtrie.\*

Douglas and Edward de Brus met the King at Craighcallie as agreed on, and about a hundred and fifty of their men gathered to them. Douglas brought word that he had passed a company of some

\* Murdoch's feat is commemorated in the arms granted to his descendants, and duly enrolled in the Lyon Register, viz. *argent*, two ravens hanging pale-wise, *sable*, with an arrow through both their heads fess-wise, *proper*.

two hundred of the enemy, carelessly bivouacked in Raploch Moss, whom he suggested they should attack at once. Falling on the sleeping soldiers before dawn, Bruce and his party took them by surprise, slew many of them, and dispersed the rest. A big stone in Raploch Moss is still pointed out as the King's resting-place after the fight.

During these events King Edward had been fretting on his sick-bed at Carlisle, wearying for news of the capture of "King Hobbe," as he called the Bruce. He had endeavoured to gain the good-will of the commonalty of Scotland by issuing a proclamation on March 13th addressed to all his officers in that country. It was to the effect that, understanding that some people interpreted his policy for restoring order as unduly harsh, which it was not his intention it should be, he now commanded that those who had been compelled by the abettors of Robert de Brus to take up arms, or to reset the said Robert by reason of his suddenly appearing among them, should be quit of all manner of punishment.\*


The olive branch was displayed in vain. Bruce's cause was beginning to win popular sympathy in Scotland, and his forces were increasing. De Valence determined to make a supreme effort to take the King. He employed a woman to enter Glen-trool and find out the exact spot where Bruce was harboured. But the spy was taken and brought before the King, who frightened her into telling him her errand, and giving him information about the position and movements of the enemy.

\* Bain, ii., 508.



From what this woman told the King, he was led to expect attack from the south, where Glentrool broadens into the valley of the Cree. The King's seat is pointed out to this day, a lofty ledge on the face of Craigmin, whence he is said to have watched for and viewed the English advance. The mountains descend at this place sharply into the lake, leaving but a narrow foothold on either shore, where men may pass in single file. Disposing his men in ambush on the heights guarding this defile, which goes by the name of the Steps of Trool, Bruce took up his post on Craigmin, whence he should give the signal for attack.

It is not known if de Valence himself was actually present with the expedition he had organised, but at any rate de Clifford, or de Waus, or both of them, marched up the Cree with 1500 men. Leaving their horses at the Borgan farm, where the Minnick joins the Cree (for beyond that point the land was impassable for cavalry), the party ascended on foot past Brighton and Minniwick, where shreds of the ancient forest of oak and birch still remain, and entered the glen about six miles above Borgan. Everything was silent and apparently deserted as they pressed on, till, arriving at the Steps of Trool, military formation had to be abandoned, and the soldiers clambered painfully along the steep shores of the lake. They were well within the jaws of the trap before they perceived any sign of the foe. Suddenly, far up on the side of Craigmin, a bugle sounded shrill. It was the King's, and as the notes died away, the hill-men sprang from their lair:



LOCH TROOL NEAR NEWTON-STEWART.  
(From a photograph by Mr. Hunter.)



stones and arrows rained upon the invaders, and great boulders crashed down among them. Then Bruce's men rushed down the steep, and a hand-to-hand fight began. The superior numbers of the English availed them not at all, for the narrowness of the path prevented those in front and those behind from supporting their comrades. There was a great slaughter; some being cut down or killed with stones, others being driven into the lake and drowned. Only those in rear of the column could take to flight, and thus escape from this dreadful glen.

The shepherds still point out a narrow strip of meadow land at the head of Loch Trool, bright green between the brown mountains and the dark waters of the lake, which they call the Soldiers' Holm; for there, it is said, the Englishmen were buried who fell in this affair.

Barbour's romantic poem receives remarkable confirmation at this point from the prosaic source of the Chancery records. The poet tells how, after the defeat in Glentrool, de Valence had "in his hart gret angir," because he found the people of Ayrshire showing signs of disaffection to their English rulers, and beginning to favour the national cause. This was, in truth, the turning-point in Bruce's fortunes and that of Scottish independence. A letter written from Forfar on May 15, 1307, by one in the English interest whose name has not been preserved, announced to some one at King Edward's Court that Robert de Brus had never before possessed so large a degree of good-will, either

among his own followers or with the people at large, as he did at that moment. "It now first appears," says the writer in Norman French, "that he has the right, and God is openly for him." He adds that a prophecy of Merlin has been discovered, to the effect that, after the death of *Le Roi Coueytous*, the Scots and the Bretons shall league together, have the sovereign hand, and live in accord to the world's end.\* Doubtless the writer had heard the news of the battle of Loudon on May 10th, for he speaks of the English army being in retreat, not to return; but some marked change in public opinion must have taken place in April to make that battle possible. Notwithstanding the manner in which Bruce was hemmed in on all sides by disciplined troops under experienced knights, every pass from the hills being strictly guarded, he managed to give them all the slip, and, passing along the moors by Dalmellington to Muirkirk, appeared early in May in the north of Ayrshire. That he should have accomplished this alone, or attended by a handful of adherents, would have been surprising in itself, even for one so prompt, so active, and so well trained in woodcraft. But the astonishing thing was, and still remains, that he was able to take the field with a sufficient force to accept de Valence's challenge to open battle.

---

\* Bain, ii., 513.





Patrick, Earl of Dunbar and March.



Sir Dougal Macdouall of Galloway.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### DEATH OF EDWARD I. CAMPAIGNS OF EDWARD II.

A.D. 1307-1313.

AYMER DE VALENCE, frustrated in his attempts to take King Robert in Glentrool, had retired to Bothwell castle on the Clyde and, hearing that Bruce was recruiting in Kyle and Cunninghame, sent out Sir John de Moubray\* to scour that country. Bruce detached Douglas with some sixty men to watch his movements. Douglas succeeded in leading de Moubray into an ambush at a place near Kilmarnock—

“That is in Machyrnokis way,  
The Edryfurd it hat perfay”—†

and routing his party with slaughter. This must have been early in May, for a few days later de Valence himself appeared in Cunninghame with a large


\* Barbour calls him Sir Philip, confounding him with the governor of Stirling seven years later.

† *The Brus*, xl., 33.

force, the King of Scots having his headquarters at Galston. De Valence, who rode with a brilliant staff, adorned with all the heraldic splendour of that age, seems to have treated the King of Scots with the ceremony customary between knightly opponents, though the contrast between the two hosts in equipment and display must have been a strange one, and to have been careful, by omitting none of the usages of chivalrous warfare, to give him no excuse for avoiding a battle, of the result of which de Valence can have felt little doubt.

Formal challenges were exchanged. Robert de Brus had with him about 600 fighting men and about as many "rangale" (rabble); whereas Barbour puts the English strength at 3000. But the King had the advantage in position. He had chosen his ground on the face of Loudon Hill, where both his flanks were protected by peat mosses, impassable by cavalry; across the hard ground in front he dug three trenches uniting the mosses, and a passage was left between the trenches, so that the enemy might be tempted to attack from that quarter.

The fighting began in the foremost trench, where the King himself was in command. As usual, the English sent forward a cloud of bowmen, but archery was of no avail against men lying in a trench, so de Valence ordered up his cavalry to dislodge the Scots. Their attack also was ineffective, men and horses recoiling before the solid hedge of pikes. The Scots had learnt a dangerous trick of thrusting these pikes into the bowels of the horses, which, maddened with pain and terror, swerved from the charge, and, gal-



BOTHWELL CASTLE ON THE CLYDE.  
*(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)*





loping wildly back along the ridge, threw into confusion the columns of the main body.

It is difficult to account for what followed, because de Valence, even if he found himself unable to carry the position at once by assault, had enough troops to invest it closely. However, the fact remains beyond question that before night the English were in full retreat, and Bruce remained in possession of the field. It is said that the Scots even pursued the fugitives for some distance.

Barbour mentions Douglas as taking part in this action, and nothing would seem more likely than that he should have done so, were it not for a remarkable passage in a letter written from Carlisle five days after the battle, to the effect that James de Douglas had sent messengers to beg that he might be received to King Edward's peace, but that when he saw the English retreating, he changed his mind. If this be true, it shows how hopeless seemed the cause of Bruce in the judgment of his best friends; but the writer adds that what they hear one day is contradicted the next. He also describes King Edward's fury at the defeat of his viceroy, and mentions that he had sent to London for his tents, being resolved to move to Dumfries after Midsummer. Meanwhile, his cavalry, decked with leaves, had marched past before him at Pentecost, which made him pleased and very merry.\*

The battle of Loudon Hill marked the crisis in the fortunes of Robert de Brus. It was the first

\* *National MSS. of Scotland*, vol. ii., No. 13.

time that he had met the English in the open field, and his success, added to the losses inflicted on them in Glentool, at Turnberry, and at Douglas, did much to inspire confidence among those already enrolled under his banner, as well as to attract recruits to his army. Some one has said that success is a horrible thing—it is so easily mistaken for merit. But ill success must be accounted even more horrible, for it robs merit of the support it ought to have. King Robert now began to reap the reward that success ensures to any cause apart from its merit. Still, it is difficult to believe that King Edward, had he lived, would have been baffled in reducing Scotland to subjection, backed as he was by many of her most powerful barons, such as the Earls of March, Fife, and Buchan, and by the chieftains of the old native race, such as the Macdoualls of Galloway and of Lorn. Sheer weight of numbers and superiority of resources, in the strong hands of Edward “Longshanks,” must have prevailed in the end, even against one so redoubtable as his former vassal.

Aymer de Valence retreated to Ayr from the field of Loudon Hill. Three days later, Bruce defeated Sir Ralph de Monthermer, who also took refuge in Ayr castle. The King of Scots invested it, but was compelled to raise the siege on the approach of fresh troops,\* and retired once more among the Galloway hills.

The violence of King Edward’s illness abated on the approach of summer. He was able to sit in the saddle once more, and prepared to enter Scotland

---

\* *Scalacronica*, 132 ; Trivet, 413 ; Hemingburgh, ii., 265.

without delay. He deposited his travelling litter in Carlisle cathedral, in gratitude for his recovery, and set out for the Border. But his once powerful frame was a sorrowful wreck. He had not ridden many miles when the dysentery returned upon him, and on June 7th he breathed his last at Burgh-on-Sands, within sight of the land which had set his authority so stubbornly at defiance. Froissart says that, feeling himself on the point of death, he sent for the Prince of Wales and called on him to swear, in presence of the barons, that so soon as his spirit should have departed, his body should be boiled till the flesh quitted the bones; that the flesh should then be buried, but that the skeleton should be carried forward with the army until the Scots should be subdued. By his will it was enjoined that his heart should be taken to the Holy Land. These directions, though perfectly in the spirit of chivalry, were disregarded. King Edward's body was laid in Westminster Abbey, and it is recorded that on his tomb was carved the legend :

EDVARDVS : PRIMVS :

SCOTTORVM : MALLEVS :

HIC : EST : PACTVM : SERVA.

“ Here is the first Edward, Hammer of the Scots. Keep covenant.”

The character of the greatest of the Plantagenets has been amply discussed by many writers; it is only so far as it influenced his policy towards Scotland, and his conduct in carrying that policy into effect, that it comes within the compass of

this narrative. From an English point of view, he was an ideal ruler for those times—a puissant knight, an experienced general, a kingly lawgiver. After his crusading fervour had cooled, all his great energy was concentrated on strengthening and consolidating his dominions. He was the first really English king, for though he still held Aquitaine and Gascony as the vassal of the King of France, Normandy had been given up by his father, and the realm of his heart was England. He believed that he was as rightfully Over-lord of Scotland as Philip of France was his Over-lord in Aquitaine. True, Richard Cœur-de-lion<sup>\*</sup>, in his anxiety to raise funds for a crusade, had sold back to the Scots the independence they had forfeited as a condition of the release of William the Lion. But the reckless Richard was far more knight-errant than King of England, and far more Norman than English. Even if he had been acting within the constitution in surrendering the suzerainty of Scotland, he had done so in the belief that he was only revoking the act of his father, Henry II., to whom he had been a rebellious son. But Edward seems to have believed honestly that the suzerainty was of far older date than the treaty of Falaise. The diligence with which, at the time of the Balliol controversy, he caused the ancient records to be ransacked, may be taken as evidence of his desire to act constitutionally. He reigned for nineteen years before the question of the Scottish succession was raised. He was on the best of terms with his kinsman, Alexander III., the best king that had ever sat on the throne of Scotland; nor would the question

ever have come to be raised, had the marriage of the Prince of Wales with the Maid of Norway been carried out. Edward had set his heart on this, for it contained the realisation of his life's dream. He had completed the conquest of Wales, and the whole island would have been united under one crown.

Then came the disputed succession. This was Edward's opportunity in one sense, for he had it in his power to nominate a puppet of his own. Scottish partisans declare that he did so; that he had made private overtures to Robert de Brus "le viel," undertaking to place him on the throne if he would do homage for his kingdom, but that de Brus refused the crown on these terms. There is not the slightest evidence of such a transaction. There is, on the other hand, clear evidence that Edward endeavoured to decide honestly a very delicate question, in the absence of precedent, and that he did so in accordance with our present principles of law. In all the preliminary proceedings he was careful to make written reservation of his claim as Lord Paramount; that claim was acknowledged by the Guardians of Scotland, and ratified by the first act of John de Balliol after his coronation. Thus, whatever may have been the relations between the two kingdoms on the death of Alexander III. in 1286, the King of England was the legitimate Over-lord of Scotland in 1295, and had been acknowledged as such by the Scottish King and people. The English view is, that when Balliol formed a treaty with Philip of France and renounced his fealty, Edward was acting within his rights in treating him and his subjects as rebels.

Viewed from the Scottish standpoint, Edward's character and conduct reflect much darker hues. Besides the accusation of partial judgment in the award given between the competitors, he has been bitterly blamed for cruelty in the Scottish war. But this charge should be dispassionately weighed according to the standard of humanity in the thirteenth century. The sack of Berwick was undoubtedly a hideous affair, and if, as is probable, it took place before the outrages, not less hideous, committed during Buchan's raid in Tynedale, it had not even the excuse of being a reprisal. But these horrors on either side of the eastern Border were so nearly simultaneous that they may be fairly set against one another. Neither side can throw the first stone. Nothing of the same kind ever happened again; women and non-combatants seem to have been respected by both sides.

It would, however, be difficult to get Scotsmen to estimate without prejudice the justice of the execution of Wallace. They are rightly indignant at the judicial murder of the patriot. He had never sworn fealty to Edward, therefore it has been held that Edward was unjust in treating him as a rebel. But he was taken in arms, in the act of leading in rebellion those who were technically Edward's subjects, within what were technically Edward's dominions. The law under which he suffered was a frightfully severe one, but it was the law of the land, and the fact that Wallace never swore fealty was, in his judge's eyes, only an aggravation of his guilt.

Then came the atrocious murder of the two Comyns,

and who shall say that the old King did not well to be wroth thereat? He ordered that all who were present at or consenting to the deed, should be put to death. The prisoners taken at Kildrummie and elsewhere were hanged without trial, while, on the Scottish side, those taken in the "Douglas Larder" were butchered in cold blood. The treatment was as savage on one side as on the other. Still, it cannot be claimed for Edward that he did anything to mitigate the horrors of mediæval warfare; the utmost that can be said is that he did not wantonly intensify them. At this distance of time, Scotsmen may well afford to acknowledge that, if they had a splendid champion in Robert de Brus, they had a noble enemy in the first Edward.

The effect of Edward's death on the fortunes of Robert de Brus was neither tardy nor doubtful. For several weeks before and after that event, de Valence tarried in the west, endeavouring with all his might to take the King of Scots. On June 1st he was at Bothwell, ordering 800 men to reinforce the garrison of Ayr, besides masons and carpenters to repair the castle.\* On the 11th, he had moved his headquarters to Ayr, and early in August was leading a fresh raid into Carrick and Glentrool. He was at Dalmellington on July 17th to 19th, and by the 24th had scoured the hill country as far as the Glenkens.† At the end of the month he returned empty-handed to Ayr, whence

\* Bain, ii., 515.

† *Ibid.*, 520.



his last despatch was issued, requiring wines and victuals to be sent from Dumfries for nine knights whom he was leaving in charge of the former town.\* Aymer de Valence then returned to England, and either resigned or was removed from the command of Scotland, which had brought him so little glory. John of Brittany, Earl of Richmond, was appointed Lieutenant and Guardian of Scotland in his place, September 13, 1307.†

Upon Edward II. now devolved the command of the army assembled by his sire for the subjugation of Scotland.

The new King of England was heralded by a prophecy, singularly mendacious, as the event proved. Merlin, it seems, had foretold of him "that a goat of the herd of Venus should succeed, with a silver beard and golden horns, breathing from his nostrils so great a cloud that the whole extent of the islands should be darkened." It would be superfluous to repeat nonsense such as this, but for the influence which it undoubtedly carried in a superstitious age. The monkish compiler of the contemporary *Annales Londinenses* clearly attaches some importance to it, and confidently pronounced the brighter of at least two interpretations of which the saying was capable. He declares that in Edward II. would be revealed the fulfilment of the prophet Daniel's vision—the goat coming from the west—and that by his surpassing military genius he would subdue the whole

\* Bain, ii., 521.

† *Ibid.*, iii., 3.

realm of King Arthur, namely, Scotland, Norway, Denmark, and France.

Edward of Carnarvon soon betrayed how little of the resolute spirit of the father had descended on the son. He accompanied the late King's body several days' march to the south, and returning to Carlisle before the end of July, he received there the homage of his barons. His first act was to create Piers de Gaveston, his chief favourite, Earl of Cornwall, a man whom Edward I., with right instinct, had always held in abhorrence. Edward II. was at Dumfries on August 5th, whence he marched up Nithsdale to Cumnock. On the 25th of that month the English army received orders to march back again to England. One can but guess at the motive of this inglorious retreat. The most likely cause is to be found in the indolent and pleasure-loving nature of the young King, who, shrinking from the hardships of a campaign in a stormy climate, and listening to the persuasions of his evil genius Gaveston, longed for the dissipations of his own capital.

The King of Scots was not one to falter in such an opportunity. No sooner were the English over the Border than he left the fastnesses of Glentrool, swept down on the lowlands of Galloway, and avenged the fate of his brothers by wasting the lands of Sir Dougal Macdouall, who had given them up to the English.\* Sir John de St. John commanded the English troops in Galloway at this time, but, in conse-

---

\* Bain, iii., 3.

quence of the raid, the Earl of Richmond was directed to march thither with all the force at his disposal. It did not suit King Robert's tactics to meet the new Viceroy in the open. He harboured among the hills he knew so well, levying tribute and enrolling recruits. These southern uplands are hallowed in the remembrance of the people of our day, chiefly by reason of the sufferings of the Covenanters; but that should not obliterate their earlier glory as the scene of the adventures of the Bruce—the true birth-place of Scottish independence.

According to the *Chronicle of Lanercost*, Richmond drove the King of Scots from the district, but there is no evidence of any encounter having taken place, and it must have been in accordance with his deliberate strategy that Bruce avoided one, and moved northwards in the early winter of 1307, in order to raise the people in the national cause. With him went his brother Edward, the Earl of Lennox, Sir Gilbert de la Haye, and Sir Robert Boyd, but he left a formidable lieutenant in the person of Sir James de Douglas, to carry on hostilities in the south.

Douglas began by retaking his own castle of that name, which the English had been busy rebuilding since its destruction in the "Douglas Larder." He had already made a second attempt upon it, though without success; but this time his plans were laid with greater care.

It was on the morning of Lanark fair, in September or October, 1307, that Douglas, having laid a strong ambush near the castle, caused fourteen of

his men to pull countrymen's frocks over their armour, to fill sacks with grass and place them on the backs of their horses. They were told then to lead them in full view of the castle, as if on their way to the fair. Douglas calculated on the English commander, whom he knew to be short of provender, not allowing a train of well-filled sacks to pass unmolested.

Things turned out exactly as he expected. The constable of the castle, Sir John de Wanton, led a party to capture the convoy, but just as he overtook them, the supposed rustics threw off their frocks, flung the sacks to the ground, leapt into the saddles, and there was Sir John, face to face with a compact little body of well-armed cavalry. At the same moment, Douglas led out his ambush, and the English, taken in front and rear, were overpowered and nearly all slain. De Wanton fell, and his men, thus left without a leader, surrendered to Douglas, who razed the castle, but spared the lives of the garrison. Of Sir John de Wanton, Barbour, who calls him de Webetoun, mentions a romantic circumstance. It seems that he loved a lady, who would consent to wed him only on the condition that he should prove himself "ane gud bachelor" by defending for a whole year—

"The aventurous castell of Douglass,  
That to kep sa peralous was."

A letter to that effect from the lady was found on the knight's body.

The national cause, which had been greatly

strengthened in the north by the adhesion of Simon and Alexander Fraser, came near to ruin towards the end of 1307, by reason of the King's health breaking down. Robert was still a young man in years, being only thirty-three; but, although of a splendid natural constitution and great bodily strength, the hardships he had come through had told upon him terribly. Months of exposure, excessive fatigue, and uncertain diet had reduced him so low that, falling sick at Inverurie, he lay for several weeks in great peril of death. Edward de Brus felt uneasy about the safety of the King in the low country, for Buchan and de Moubray were known to be collecting forces to bring against him, and Edward was unwilling to meet them in battle unless the King were able to lead his men in person. Therefore a move was made to the Sliach, a hilly part of Drumblade parish in north-west Aberdeenshire, whither the King was carried in a litter. Here the hill called Robin's Height is supposed to mark the site of the King's headquarters, and, with the Meet Hillock, to have been put in a state of defence.

Buchan advanced to the attack, but, as it seems, without much spirit. During three days, the country being covered with snow, he "bikkered" the King's men with his archers. Edward de Brus, being badly provisioned, could not hold the position any longer, so the King was again put in his litter and placed in the centre of the column, which marched out in full view of the enemy. For some unknown reason, Buchan, who outnumbered his enemy by

two to one, allowed them to decamp unmolested, and reach Strathbogie, where the sick King rested for some days. Thence, as he began to get stronger, they moved him to his old quarters at Inverurie, preferring the risk of being attacked in the plains to the certainty of starvation in the hills.

Buchan, with Sir David de Brechin and Sir John de Moubray, lay at Old Meldrum. On Christmas Eve, 1307, de Brechin beat up Bruce's quarters at Inverurie at daybreak, slaying some of the outposts and driving the rest into the village. The news of this brush with the enemy acted like a tonic on the sick King, who declared it did him more good than all the drugs they had been giving him—not, perhaps, an extravagant statement, if account be taken of the state of chirurgery in the fourteenth century.

For several months after this we hear no more of either Bruce or Buchan. It is quite likely that Buchan's inactivity was the result of the growing popularity of Bruce and the idea of independence. Failing some such reason, it seems amazing that such a favourable chance of capturing or crushing the King of Scots was allowed to slip. Barbour, whose faithfulness in recording numbers has already been noticed, puts Bruce's force at no more than 700, and great must have been the difficulty of supporting even so small a number, had the country been generally hostile. Whatever may have been his excuse, Buchan was to pay a heavy price for his want of vigour. The King of Scots, by this time convalescent, surprised him at Old Meldrum on May 22, 1308, routed his men, and then proceeded to lay waste his lands

in such sort that this raid was long afterwards remembered as the "Hership of Buchan."

"Eftir that wele fifty yher

Men menit \* the herschip † of Bouchane."‡

Buchan made no attempt to protect his lands, but passed south with de Moubray, leaving his unhappy tenants to their fate. Henceforward he made Gallo-way his peculiar care, of which district he had been appointed warden, while to Sir John de Moubray was committed Annandale, and Carrick to Sir Ingelram de Umfraville.§ Robert de Umfraville, Earl of Angus, and Sir William de Ros of Hamelake were made by Edward II. his joint Lieutenants and Guardians of Scotland, in place of the Earl of Richmond. They were to have special charge of the district between Berwick and Forth. From the Forth to the Orkneys the command was entrusted to Sir Alexander de Abernethy, Sir Edmund de Hastings, and Sir John FitzMarmaduke. Recapitulation of these details may seem tedious, but it is only on examining them that it becomes apparent how great were the odds against which Robert de Brus had matched

\* Moaned for.

† Devastation.

‡ *The Brus*, lxx., 6. Barbour is here telling of what was within his own knowledge. People in Aberdeenshire were still talking of the hership of Buchan when he, the Archdeacon of Aberdeen, was writing his poem. The late Lord Salton was of opinion that the battle took place on Christmas Eve, 1307 (*The Frasers of Philorth*, vol. i., pp. 62, 63, vol. ii., pp. 183-194); but Fordun mentions Ascension Day (May 22, 1308) as the date, and Mr. Bain gives good grounds for his accuracy on this point (Bain, iii., p. xii., note).

§ Bain, iii., 9.

himself, and how the King of England followed the example of his father in employing his best officers in the task of quelling the movement.

But how great is the contrast between the document in which these appointments are notified \* and the imperious missives of the first Edward! An army had been ordered to assemble at Carlisle on August 23, 1308, to carry on the Scottish war, "nevertheless the King for divers reasons delays the said aid of men-at-arms at that date, for he does not mean to go to Scotland so soon as he thought. Also, the foot to be warned not to come to Carlisle yet. So also the carriages to be countermanded."

Nor was this all. Edward, indeed, declared that he would make no truce with Robert de Brus, "but the Wardens of Scotland there may take such [truce] as long as possible, provided that the King [Edward] may continue to furnish his castles with men and victuals." The endorsement of this memorandum is still more explicit, and marks a remarkable change in the relative positions of the two Kings. The following is a translation of the original French:

"Letters of credence in Sir John le fuiz Marmeduk's name, to be written to the Earl of Angus and Sir William de Ros of Hamelake, the Guardians of Scotland, that it is the King's pleasure they take truce from Robert de Bruys, as from themselves, as long as they can, but not beyond the month of Pasques (Easter, 1309), so that if on one side or other people are taken or misprision made, it may be redressed; and the King [Edward] to victual and garrison his castles during the truce; and that he may break the truce at pleasure, if the others will yield this point; but if they will not, the truce is to be made without it."

---

\* Bain, iii., 9.



In fact, the King of England had troubles enough at home to justify him in making almost any terms with the King of Scots. The clouds of coming tempest were gathering round him. The honours with which he had loaded his Gascon favourite, Piers Gaveston, had infuriated his English barons, who had refused to allow the King to be crowned, until he would agree to let their demands be submitted to Parliament. The coronation, it is true, had been performed on February 25th, but the dispute remained as violent as before.

There is nothing to show whether the English commanders made overtures to Bruce according to their instructions; though perhaps an undated letter from the Earl of Ross, making excuses for having taken truce from Robert de Brus, may be referred to this period. It is certain that if any proposals were made to him, the King of Scots was far too stern in his purpose to listen to them. No doubt his many friends and kinsmen at the English Court would keep him well informed of Edward's difficulties. Every day brought him fresh adherents. Sir David de Brechin—the same who led the successful reconnaissance against Bruce's entrenchments at Inverurie—had shut himself up in his castle of Brechin after Buchan's defeat at Old Meldrum. David, Earl of Athol, son of the earl executed after the capture of Kildrummie, sat down before it, and succeeded in persuading the knight to surrender and join the national cause. In the south, Sir James Douglas scored a still more important success. He must have found the men of Tweeddale well disposed to Bruce,

for the lands of Aymer de Valence, now Earl of Pembroke, were forfeited by King Edward, because his tenants had "traitorously joined Robert de Brus." One night Douglas arrived at a house on the Water of Lyne, intending to rest there till the morrow; but he found it already occupied. Cautiously approaching a window, he listened to the voices within, and, from the nature of certain expressions,\* judged that there were strangers there. He caused his men to surround the house, and bursting open the door, surprised the inmates before they could get into their harness. There was a confused struggle in the dark, in which Adam de Gordon and some soldiers escaped; but they left behind them two prisoners of great value—no less than Thomas, the son of Randolph of Strathdon, King Robert's nephew, and Sir Alexander of Bonkill, brother of James the Steward and first cousin of Douglas.

The King of Scots, when Thomas was brought before him, said he hoped his nephew would be reconciled now to his rightful monarch. But Thomas (who in deference to popular custom must be referred to henceforward under the name of Randolph) is said to have answered fiercely, taunting his uncle with having challenged the King of England to

\* "Nerhand the hous, sa listnet he,  
And herd thar sawis ilke dele [every part of what they said],  
And be that persavit wele  
That tha war strange men."—*The Brus*, lxxiv., 15.

In the Edinburgh MS. (1489) the second line runs :

"Herd ane say tharin 'the Dewill.'"

open war, yet stooping to unknighly ruses. Upon this the King ordered him into prison, which soon brought the young esquire to a more proper frame of mind, and before March, 1309, he had so far committed himself that King Edward forfeited his manor of Stichel in Roxburghshire, and bestowed it on Adam de Gordon, who had escaped from Douglas on the night of Randolph's capture.\* Randolph was soon after this created Earl of Moray, a name he was to make famous by services which amply atoned for his early disaffection to the Bruce. Bonkill must have made his escape, because four years later he was still in dutiful relations to Edward II., but both he and Gordon made submission to Bruce before the battle of Bannockburn.†

Bruce's ancient ally and adviser, de Lamberton, Bishop of St. Andrews, having lain in prison for more than a year, was released at this time by King Edward, who told the Pope he relied on the Bishop's influence to bring the Scots to terms. The Bishop had to find security for his good behaviour, to swear fealty to Edward, and to pay a fine of six thousand marks.

For some weeks after the raid of Buchan, the King of Scots seems to have kept very quiet, gathering strength after his illness and organising his resources. But before the end of the summer of 1308, Edward de Brus had taken the field again and was

---

\* Stichel remained the property of the Gordons of Lochinvar till 1628, when John, afterwards Viscount Kenmure, sold it to Robert Pringle.

† Bain, iii., 54.

carrying all before him in Galloway. This prince seems to have had the gifts of physical strength, military capacity, and the art of inspiring enthusiasm in a degree only second to the King himself.

“ This Schir Eduard, forsuth I hicht,  
Was of his handis ane nobill knicht,  
And in blithnes swet and joly ;  
Bot he was outrageous hardy,

He discumfit comonly  
Mony with quhene.” \*

The English commanders in Galloway were Sir Ingelram de Umfraville, kinsman of the murdered Comyn and brother of the Earl of Angus, and Sir John de St. John (not “schir Amy of Sancte Johne” as Barbour has it). Sir Ingelram was of such high renown in chivalry that he was distinguished wherever he went by a red cap, borne before him on a spear point. Edward de Brus entering Galloway from the north by the passes from Ayrshire, encountered and defeated these two commanders somewhere on the Cree (probably on the favourite camping-ground which now forms Kirouchtrie park), and forced them to retire to Buittle castle. St. John went to England for reinforcements and returned with 1500 horse, determined to disperse de Brus’s band. Edward de Brus, however, got timely warning of his approach, and disposing his infantry in ambush in a deep glen, rode out to reconnoitre with some fifty light horse. Sir Alan de Cathcart, who was present with de Brus in this affair, de-

\* “Many with few.”—*The Brus*, lxxiii., 9.

scribed to Barbour what followed. The Scots, favoured by a thick mist, drew near the line of St. John's march, fell suddenly out of the darkness upon his flank, rode through and through the column three times, and put the English to flight.

This brilliant exploit brought in many of the people of Galloway to King Robert's peace, so that one by one the fortresses of that country fell into Edward de Brus's hands, the English garrisons were driven out, and by the end of the year the land was pretty well subdued. Dougal Macdouall, the native chief of Galloway, had to fly before those whose displeasure he had done so much to earn, and King Edward granted him the manor of Temple-Couton in Yorkshire as a reward for his services.

Edward de Brus having thus humbled the pride of the Macdoualls of Galloway, King Robert turned his attention to the west, where the other branch of that clan, under Alexander of Argyll and his son John of Lorn, still resisted his authority.

It was probably in August, 1308, that Bruce entered Argyll by the foot of Ben Cruachan—

“Crechanben hicht that montane,  
I trow that nocht in all Bretane  
Ane hear \* hill may fundin be.” †

The trusty Douglas was with the King once more, and Bruce, finding the passes strongly beset with Highlanders, detached him to take the defenders in flank, while he himself advanced up the defile. By these tactics he won the pass, and drove Argyll's

\* Higher.

† *The Brus*, lxxv., 27.

men before him along the shores of Loch Awe to the pass of Brander, where the river Awe flows deep and dark from the great lake. The rest of the autumn and winter was employed in reducing the stronghold of Dunstaffnage, which must have fallen before March, 1309, for on the 16th of that month King Robert held his first Parliament at St. Andrews. On March 11th, John of Lorn wrote to inform King Edward that Robert de Brus had invaded his country with 10,000 or 15,000 men (assuredly an exaggeration), and that he had only 800 with which to resist him, for the barons of Argyll would afford him no help. Yet he says that Bruce had asked for a truce, which he had granted for a short time, in order to allow English reinforcements to arrive. This alleged truce, the truce for which Lorn represents the King of Scots as suing, was, in fact, part of the terms granted to Alexander of Argyll when he surrendered Dunstaffnage; but John took to his galleys and escaped to England. His father must have followed him thither later, for both were in council at Westminster, with other "loyal Scots," on June 16th. Thus Barbour's statement that Alexander submitted, while his son John took shipping and fled to England, may be reconciled with the apparently contradictory one by Fordun, that Alexander refused homage and fled to England. Neither of these chiefs ever returned to Scotland. Alexander died in Ireland in 1309, but John continued in the service of England till his death in 1317.\*

---

\* Bain, iii., 37.

King Edward's diplomacy had now won over the Pope to his interest. Clement V. issued a mandate of excommunication against Robert, Earl of Carrick, recalling his broken vows of fealty to Edward I., his murder of Comyn, and reciting how, not content with these crimes, but "damnably persevering in iniquity," he had treated with contempt the letters of excommunication issued against him by the Bishop of London. Milder measures were tried also, for Edward was in no condition to wage war at the time, and, on the mediation of the King of France, a truce was agreed on. It was of no long duration, however, each side accusing the other of breaking it. But such was the disorder of King Edward's realm, that in August he was forced to reopen negotiations for peace.\* It is evident, from the appointment of Sir John de Menteith as one of King Robert's commissioners, that one of the staunchest of King Edward's Scottish barons had deserted his cause.

The confusion of affairs in England was reflected in the frequent changes made by Edward in the Wardenship of Scotland. The Earl of Angus and Sir William de Ros of Hamelake having succeeded the Earl of Richmond as joint Wardens on June 21, 1308, Henry de Beaumont was added as a third on August 16, 1309; but four days later separate patents were made out in favour of Angus and Sir Robert de Clifford, constituting each of them sole Guardian, "because the King was uncertain which of them would accept that office."† Pending their

\* Bain, iii., 19.

† Hailes, ii., 57.

decision, Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester, was appointed Captain-General in Scotland (September 14th); yet on October 6th the King gave instructions to Sir John de Segrave as Guardian of Scotland.\* Again, on December 20th, de Clifford received his commission as sole Warden until Easter, 1310,† when de Segrave was again appointed, April 10th, with instructions to do all the harm he can to the enemy.‡

Nothing could suit Bruce's purpose so well as a hesitating policy on the part of England; nothing else could have saved him from the overwhelming superiority in resources of his enemy. As matters turned out, the King of Scots was able to enjoy some repose after his expedition to Argyll, broken only by a raid into Clydesdale, when he laid siege to the important castle of Rutherglen. This, however, he was obliged to abandon on the approach of the Earl of Gloucester.

Lord Hailes thinks it probable that a truce was concluded on February 16, 1309; but it must have been a short one, for in September King Edward invaded Scotland. He marched by a new and somewhat hazardous route, by way of Selkirk (September 21st), St. Boswells (21st), Roxburgh (23d to 28th), Biggar (October 1st to 14th), Lanark (15th), Renfrew (15th), Linlithgow (23d to 28th).§ Bruce's policy was to avoid an encounter, for he had not

---

\* Bain, iii., 19.

† *Ibid.*, 21.

‡ *Ibid.*, 21.

§ *Ibid.*, 32.



forgotten the lessons of Falkirk and Dunbar. He trusted to driving away all cattle and other supplies before the invaders, and so rendering it impossible for them to exist in what had become practically a desert. Edward's spies brought him news that the King of Scots was encamped on a moor near Stirling, but the English were unable to persevere, and went into winter quarters at Berwick.

Negotiations were set on foot; a meeting took place at Selkirk before Christmas between King Robert and Sir Robert de Clifford and Sir Robert Fitzpain, and a further interview was fixed, to be held near Melrose. At this the English were to have been represented by the Earl of Gloucester, and Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall, but Bruce, being warned that treachery was intended, avoided the meeting.

Cornwall was now Warden north of the Forth, and remained at Perth till April, 1311, when his place was taken by Sir Henry de Percy. King Edward, constantly wrangling with his barons, lingered at Berwick till the end of July, when he went reluctantly to London to meet the Parliament he had delayed so long to summon. He left behind him the Bishop of St. Andrews, to conduct negotiations with the King of Scots as opportunity might arise.\* When Parliament met, the barons showed themselves far more deeply incensed against the Earl of Cornwall than against Robert de Brus. Sentence of perpetual exile was pronounced on the detested Gascon, and the Archbishop of Canterbury threatened with

---

\* Bain, iii., 46.

excommunication all who henceforth should receive or support him.\*

Hardly had King Edward turned his back on the Border before his vigilant foe assumed the offensive. Crossing the Solway on August 12, 1311, Bruce burnt all Gilsland, Haltwistle, and a great part of Tynedale, and returned in eight days with great spoil of cattle. But even the chronicler of Lanercost, a friar of Carlisle, with plenty of cause to detest the Scots, admits that Bruce allowed few men to be slain, except those who resisted. On September 8th, King Robert was over the Border again, raiding Reedsdale, Harbottle, Corbridge, and all that country for the space of fifteen days; but refraining from slaying men, or burning houses.† Northumberland lay at his mercy, and the inhabitants bought a truce, to last till February 2d following, at the price of £2000.

During the winter of 1311-12 King Edward held his Court at York;‡ nevertheless, Bruce raided the Borders on the expiry of the truce, and exacted fresh tribute from them, taking advantage of the events which, in June, culminated in the execution of the Earl of Cornwall, who had unwisely returned from exile.

King Robert held a Parliament at Ayr at midsummer, and then sent his brother to harry the English Border. Edward de Brus succeeded well in

---

\* *Lanercost*, 216.

† *Ibid.*, 217.

‡ Not Berwick, as Hailes read it, mistaking Everwick, the old form of the name York, for that of the Border town.

this expedition, for, having burned once more the oft-calcined towns of Hexham and Corbridge, he granted a truce till June 24, 1313, on payment of £2000 in cash by each of the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, and Durham. Such contributions served to replenish the exchequer of the King of Scots, who was able now to turn his attention to reducing strongholds within his own realm.

Access to the public records has made it possible to supplement and amend the chronology of early writers, and at the same time to verify many of the details given by them of this period. Barbour is charitably silent about an unsuccessful attempt made by Bruce on Berwick castle, on the night of December 6, 1311; but the chronicler of Lanercost minutely describes the rope-ladders, which he himself had seen, used by the Scots in their assault. They were, he says, of an ingenious and novel design. A dog barked at the critical moment of the escalade, the garrison were roused, and the assailants made off, leaving their ladders hanging.

Forfar was probably the first place of strength to fall into the hands of the Scots—some time in 1312, and, according to Bruce's invariable practice, the fortifications were immediately destroyed. Buittle, Dalswinton, Caerlaverock, and perhaps Lochmaben, commanding the valleys of the Dee, the Nith, and the Annan, followed not long after, surrendering to Edward de Brus. Perth, a far stronger place than Forfar, was besieged by the King of Scots in person. It was commanded by that Sir William de Oliphant

who, in 1304, had defended Stirling so gallantly against Edward I. Bruce lay before it for six weeks, and then, having marked the shallowest part of the moat, made a feint of raising the siege, and marched away. A week later, on January 8, 1313, he returned at midnight, and, probing the way with his spear, waded through the water as high as his throat. The next to follow was a French knight, who was amazed to see the King run such risks to win "ane wrechit hamilet," and then came the escalading party with ladders. The garrison kept no watch; relying on the strength of their defences, they and the townsfolk woke to find the place in possession of the enemy. Young Malise of Strathearn was with Bruce, but his father, the earl, was of the defending force, and was made prisoner. The King gave strict orders against unnecessary slaughter, seeing that the garrison were "kind [akin] to the cuntre," that is, that they were Scots, though in English pay. But his needy followers were allowed to equip themselves from the merchandise found in the town.\*

The next place taken, Dumfries, was one of great importance to the defence of the Western Marches. This castle had been under the command of Sir Dougal Macdouall of Galloway since 1311. He had to surrender on February 7, 1313, owing to failure of supplies, for which he had often written in vain to the keeper of stores at Carlisle, by reason of which many of his garrison had deserted.† The

---

\* *The Brus*, lxxi. Barbour erroneously dates the fall of Perth and other places before the King's expedition to Argyll and Lorn.


† Bain, iii., 56.

King of Scots now had it in his power to avenge the blood of his brothers, whom Macdouall had delivered to the gallows at Carlisle in 1307; but he showed a magnanimous forbearance, and Macdouall continued in the service of England till his death in 1327.\*

Barbour describes the capture of Linlithgow castle as taking place in 1309; but it was certainly in the hands of the English till July 10, 1313, Sir Peter de Luband being in command with a mixed garrison of English, Scots, and Irish.† As he says distinctly that the assault took place in harvest time, the real date was, in all likelihood, September, 1313. This time the poet has to record the valour, not of some high-born knight, but of a simple countryman called Bunnock, who got himself hired by the garrison to cart in the hay they had cut by the lakeside. Choosing a time when the soldiers were at work in the harvest-field, he placed a party in ambush near the castle. He then concealed eight armed men in his wain under the hay, gave the lad who led the horses a sharp axe with instructions how to use it, and proceeded to the castle gate with his load. The porter threw all wide to admit the wain, but just as it was entering the gate, Bunnock turned the horses' heads so that it stuck fast in the gangway. At the same moment, the lad cut the

\* Bain, ii., 171. In estimating Bruce's magnanimity, it should be remembered that the ransom of a knight such as Macdouall was a consideration of moment, if not to the King himself, who perhaps was not present at the taking of Dumfries, at all events to Macdouall's captor.

† *Ibid.*, 411, 412.



CLACKMANNAN CASTLE, THE RESIDENCE OF ROBERT, IN 1314.

*(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)*



ropes of the drawbridge, so that it could not be raised, the eight fellows sprang from under the hay, slew the unhappy porter, overpowered the few men left in the castle, and the ambush running up made all secure before the return of the party from the harvest. And thus the important "pele" of Linlithgow was won. From the muster rolls that year it appears that the garrison included 88 horse besides a considerable number of foot soldiers.\*

On the expiry of the truce with the northern English counties on June 24th, of this year, Bruce threatened another descent upon them; whereupon, despairing of any succour from their own King, they once more paid a heavy tribute as the price of an extension till September 29, 1314.† Great events were to take place before that date came round,

At this time it is believed that King Robert resided chiefly at Clackmannan castle, within easy reach of Stirling.

---

\* Bain, iii., 423.

† *Lanercost*, 222.







Sir Gilbert de Clare,  
Earl of Gloucester.



Sir Giles de Argentine.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE BATTLE OF BANNOCKBURN.

A.D. 1314.

THE year 1314 proved a memorable one for the fortunes of the King of Scots and his people.

It opened with the capture of Roxburgh Castle by Sir James Douglas on Shrove Tuesday, March 6th, when the garrison were occupied with the usual merry-making on the eve of Lent. Douglas picked sixty men and made them cover their armour with black "froggis," and approach the castle on all fours, so that in the dusk they might be mistaken for cattle in the meadows. A craftsman called Sym of the Ledous (Leadhouse) had prepared rope ladders with hooks to fling over the battlements, and was himself the first to scale the wall, slaying the sentinel who was aroused by the noise. Another man running up shared the same fate. Then Douglas and his men climbed up without further hindrance, and, forming up in the courtyard, burst into the great hall where the people were dancing, with loud

shouts of "Douglas! Douglas!" The governor, Sir William de Fiennes, a knight of Gascony, was in the keep, and held it all the next day; but having been severely wounded in the face, he surrendered on condition of being allowed to march out with the honours of war and pass into England. He died of his wound not long afterwards. The loss of this castle was a serious one to England, for it commanded Teviotdale and upper Tweeddale; but Bruce, as usual, "tumlit" it to the ground.

The King's sister, Maria de Brus, who had been imprisoned in Roxburgh Castle in 1306, was no longer there when it was taken. Edward II. had signed a warrant for her exchange for Walter Comyn in March, 1310, and another in February, 1312, for her exchange for Sir Richard de Moubray, but neither transaction had been carried into effect, for she was still in prison at Newcastle in November, 1313.\*

During this same season of Lent, Thomas Randolph, having made peace with his uncle King Robert, was blockading Edinburgh Castle. One William François told him of a place on the north wall, where, while living as a youth with his father in the castle, he used to find his way out at night to visit a girl in the town. All that was wanted at this point was a ladder twelve feet long, to give access over the wall from the top of a pathway up the crags. Up this path François guided Randolph, Sir Andrew Gray, and a picked band; it is prettily told by Barbour how they managed the perilous ascent; how

\* Bain, iii., 66.

they lay close under the wall while sentries were being relieved; how a sentry flung a stone over their heads, crying, "Away! I can see you," though he saw nothing; and how, in the end, they scaled the wall, surprised the garrison, slew Sir Peter de Lubaud, the governor, and got possession of the castle.\* But he does not mention what the chronicler of Lanercost, being informed from English sources, relates, that simultaneously with the escalade on the north side, an attack was delivered on the south (it must have been on the west, and a feint), whereby the attention of the defenders was withdrawn from the real point of danger.†

The exact date of the capture or surrender of Dundee, held by Sir Alexander de Abernethy with a strong garrison, has not been ascertained; nor that of the taking of Rutherglen. But both of these strongholds fell into the hands of Edward de Brus; and, by the spring of 1314, the only important fortresses held by the English in Scotland were those of Berwick, Stirling, Bothwell, and possibly Lochmaben.

The warmest partisan in the Scottish cause cannot but feel some pity for the English commanders and soldiers, left as they were at this time without support or encouragement from their own King, in the presence of an enemy daily growing in strength. Garrison after garrison was obliged to yield to the force of numbers or stress of starvation. But a

\* *The Brus*, lxxxiv.

† *Lanercost*, 223.



STIRLING CASTLE FROM THE SOUTH-WEST.  
(From a photograph by *Valentine Bros., Dundee.*)



still darker disaster was approaching—a deeper humiliation for the proud chivalry of England.

Edward de Brus had laid siege to Stirling Castle in Lent, 1313, and it remained closely invested till midsummer. The governor, Sir Philip de Moubray, then obtained from Edward de Brus consent to a suspension of hostilities, on condition that he, Sir Philip, would surrender, if he were not relieved before Midsummer Day, 1314. When King Robert heard of this he was greatly displeased. He knew that if anything would put the chivalry of England on its mettle, and reconcile the barons with their incompetent King, it would be this summons to the rescue of a brother knight—this fixing a distant day for a supreme effort. He ever saw that his best chance lay in avoiding a general action, and in carrying on an irregular and profitable warfare on the Border, while the English Government continued distracted by civil discord. However, the mistake had been made: Edward de Brus's knightly word had been pledged, and the King of Scots was not the man to recoil from the consequences.

Matters turned out exactly as Robert had foreseen. The King of England set about making immense preparations, and, Piers Gaveston having expiated his offences on the scaffold, the barons responded heartily to the summons to arms. The Earl of Lancaster, however, with his adherents Warwick, Warenne, and Arundel, remained at home, being dissatisfied because of Edward's failure to fulfil certain pledges made to them.\* Writs were

---

\* *Lanercost*, 224.

issued for the muster at Wark, on June 11, 1314, of 21,540 foot, drawn from twelve of the midland and northern counties of England. Eth O'Connor, Celtic chief of Connaught, was invoked as an auxiliary, and King Edward's subjects in Ireland and Wales were summoned to his standard. Besides these there were contingents of Gascons and other foreign troops. The English bishops offered an indulgence of forty days to all who would offer prayer for the success of the expedition.

Lord Hailes sharply takes exception to Hume's opinion that the alleged total of 100,000 as the strength of the English army was an over-estimate; but there is, in truth, nothing to show that it approached that figure. Barbour, indeed, asserts that the host exceeded 100,000, but he puts the cavalry alone at the exorbitant cypher of 40,000, a number which it would have been utterly impossible to maintain in a country where agriculture had suffered from years of desolating war. It is true that the English fleet co-operated with the army, but it would have plenty to do in landing supplies for 50,000, which is the most liberal estimate of the total strength of all arms that can be founded on the evidence of the Patent Rolls.\* Even this would be a very powerful army, far outnumbering any that the King of Scots could put in the field against it.

The official evidence still extant of the force of the English in this campaign, is wholly wanting as

\* Bain, iii., Introduction, xxi.

regards the strength of the Scottish host. Barbour puts it at 30,000, but it is difficult to believe that Bruce had anything like that number under arms. Admitting, as nearly all authorities agree to do, that the English army bore to the Scottish the proportion of three to one, it seems reasonable to put the latter at 20,000 at most. Both hosts, no doubt, were followed by a huge swarm of "pitaille"—camp-followers and rascals of all sorts, who always gathered in the wake of mediæval war.

As St. John's day—June 24th—drew near, on which it had been appointed that the destinies of the two nations were to be decided, the King of Scots encamped with all his forces in the Torwood, between Falkirk of gloomy memories and Stirling of happier associations. In the presence of the overwhelming odds brought against him, it must have taxed even his stout spirit and well-proved courage to keep foreboding at bay, when he remembered the result of the last great trial of strength between the hosts of England and Scotland—the overthrow of Wallace at Falkirk. Every advantage gained since the death of the mighty Edward, the future of his country, and his own fate—all were to be put to the hazard of a contest between two vastly unequal armies. But his nerve never forsook him. There were other memories for the King besides those of Falkirk and Dunbar. Stirling Bridge, Loudon Hill, Glentworth—each had taught the same lesson, namely, that military skill in the choice and preparation of position might, and often did, prevail against superiority of numbers and



equipment. To this task he devoted himself, and no one can appreciate the sagacity with which he accomplished it, without going carefully over the ground which he chose. But besides the technical part of his office as commander-in-chief, there was the hardly less important duty of rousing the spirit and patriotic ardour of his soldiers. None understood better than the Bruce how this was to be done. He went incessantly among his troops, advising and encouraging them, and personally superintended the execution of the works he ordered to be done. Nor did he neglect the aid of religion; for, doubly excommunicate though he was, he directed the vigil of St. John (Sunday, June 23d) to be kept as a solemn fast.

News was brought by scouts on Saturday, June 22d, that the English army had lain over night at Edinburgh,\* and was advancing by way of Falkirk. Upon this King Robert moved out upon the position which he had already chosen with great care, on some gently swelling hills, about two miles south of Stirling, with his front facing south by east. The English had the alternative of two lines of advance—by the old Roman highway, leading through the village of St. Ninians, or farther to the east, by the “carse” or plain beside the river Forth, across patches of cultivation and shallow pools of water. The King of Scots was prepared to oppose them whichever way they came, and, with great prudence, refrained from

\* Edinburgh Castle had been dismantled after its capture by Randolph the previous summer.—*The Brus*, lxxxv., 17; *Lanercost*, 223.

taking up his ground until the enemy was committed to one of these two lines. Had the English come by the carse, Bruce would have met them at a point where the Forth makes a bend and considerably narrows the level ground. Here the enemy would have been compelled greatly to reduce his front, thereby sacrificing his great advantage in numbers, especially for the operations of cavalry, an arm in which he was unusually strong.

As soon as it was evident that King Edward had chosen the upper route, through St. Ninians, Bruce took up the ground he had chosen to meet that contingency. This was in the park, where, from almost immemorial time, game had been preserved for the hunting of the Scottish kings. His army was in four divisions ; the right being under command of Edward de Brus, the second under Randolph, Earl of Moray, and the third, on the left of the line, under Walter the Steward and Douglas ; while the King himself held the fourth division in reserve. In front of the Scottish position flowed the Bannock burn, which, in summer, is but an insignificant brook. But the quick eye of Bruce had discerned its importance to his position. For less than a mile, between Parkmill on the west and Beaton's mill\* on the east, the stream runs nearly level with its banks, affording no difficulty either to horseman or foot soldier in fording it. Beyond these points, however, the banks are precipitous, and practically impassable by cavalry.

\* This is the mill where James III. was murdered in his flight from the battle of Sauchieburn, in 1488.

Edward's advance, therefore, had to be directed between these two points, and the front of his vast array reduced to a corresponding extent.

But this was very far from all. Besides the Bannock, in itself a trifling obstacle, there were two bogs, skirting each side of the ancient causeway along which Edward had to move. One of these, now called Halbert's Bog, extended from New Park, at a point opposite Charters Hall Mains, to the foot of Brock's Brae ; the other called Milton Bog, stretched from a point close to the causeway down to where the banks of the Bannock rise into wooded cliffs. These bogs lay on the north bank of the Bannock, and therefore between the Scots and the stream. They covered nearly the whole Scottish front ; but there was a piece of hard land extending along both banks westward from Charters Hall to Parkmill, though this ground, being thickly wooded, was less favourable for the operations of cavalry. Practically it came to this, that the English, in order to cross the Bannock and attack the Scottish position, would have to advance in two columns : one with a front reduced sufficiently to pass between the two bogs ; the other with a front of some two hundred yards to operate in the fringe of the Torwood, on the ground between Charters Hall and Parkmill.

Even this great disadvantage was not enough to satisfy the King of Scots. He directed and personally superintended the construction of elaborate defences against cavalry—the arm in which he felt most inferior to the English. He caused the ground between the two bogs, and also the hard land opposite

the right of his line, to be honeycombed with a multitude of round holes, measuring a foot in diameter and as deep as a man's knee, which were then covered with sods resting on small sticks.\*

On Sunday morning, June 23d, at sunrise, mass was celebrated in the Scottish camp. It was nearly noon† when tidings came of the approach of the English army from Falkirk, where they had lain the night before. Barbour says they marched in ten divisions of 10,000 each; the chronicler of Lanercost mentions eleven principal commanders, namely, the Earls of Gloucester, Hereford, Pembroke, and Angus; Sir Robert de Clifford, Sir John Comyn (son of the Red Comyn), Sir Henry de Beaumont, Sir John de Segrave, Sir Pagan de Typtoft, Sir Edmund de Maul and Sir Ingelram de Umfraville. The King of Scots called upon any of his men who feared the coming battle to depart at once, but not a man left the ranks.

The English vanguard came in sight on the rising ground near Plean. The main body, it seems, had been halted, in order that a council of war might be held, to discuss whether the attack should be made at once or deferred till the morrow. The weather was intensely hot;‡ perhaps the troops were exhausted by their march from Falkirk, although that place lies only nine miles south from Bannockburn.

\* Buchanan describes calthrops—iron spikes for laming horses—as having been scattered over the ground, but these are not mentioned by earlier writers.

† Post-prandium.—*Lanercost*, 225.

‡ *The Brus*, xciv., 115.

It was decided, apparently unwisely, to bivouack in the carse near the river, *un mauueis parfoundruscelle marras*,\* so that men and horses might be fresh for their work on the next day. Sir Thomas Gray, whose account of the battle differs in some respects from all others, and who, writing as a soldier and the son of a knight who was present, is deserving of special consideration, seems to attribute the delay to the advice of Sir Philip de Moubray, governor of Stirling, who had ridden out to meet King Edward. This knight warned the English generals how the Scots had raised obstructions in the passes of the woods (*auoint fowez les estroitx chemyns du boys*), and said that it was not necessary for them to advance farther, for that the conditions of the relief of Stirling had been fulfilled by an English army coming within three miles of that town.

The vanguard, however, pressed on, whether because the Earl of Gloucester was not informed of the halt, or because his young knights were eager for a brush with the enemy.†

There is some discrepancy in the order given by various writers to the events which immediately followed, and I have chosen to follow chiefly the narrative of Sir Thomas Gray, though other historians have generally adopted the accounts of monkish, and therefore inexpert, authorities. But Barbour's personal descriptions may be relied on with considerable confidence.

\* *Scalacronica*, 142.

† *Lez ioenes gentz ne aresterent my tindrent lour chemyns.*—*Scalacronica*, 141.

The King of Scots rode up and down his lines mounted on a palfrey—

“ane gay palfray  
Litill and joly.”

He carried a battle-axe in his hand ; on his head he wore a basnet covered with *cuir bouilli*, or “corbuyle” \* as soldiers called it, surmounted by the royal crown. In the best manner of chivalry Sir Henry de Bohun, the Earl of Hereford’s nephew, rode out alone from the English ranks, to challenge a Scottish champion to single combat. He was mounted on a powerful destrier and armed at all points ; a shudder must have run through the Scottish battalions when the King himself spurred forward on his hackney to take up the challenge. The encounter was as brief as it was decisive. De Bohun, lance in rest, charged the King, whose pony nimbly avoided the shock. Bruce, rising in his stirrups, smote the English knight on the helmet as he passed, with such violence that the axe clove his head from the crown to the chin. The axe shaft broke, and the force of the blow carried Bruce forward, so that he fell from his saddle flat on the ground.

What tremendous issues depended at that moment on the nerve and skill of a single mortal ! The whole future history of Great Britain, involving the existence of dynasties and the welfare of millions, was staked on the fibre of one arm and the coolness of one head. For the effect of such an episode on

\* *Corbuyle*, leather greatly thickened and hardened : jacked leather.—*Jamieson’s Dictionary*.

the minds of superstitious soldiers cannot be overestimated, happening as it did on the eve of a pitched battle, for which a whole year had been spent in preparation. It is easy to believe that, as Barbour describes, Bruce's barons hotly remonstrated with him for having risked so much and imperilled a life of such supreme value; but it is equally easy to imagine to what pitch of confidence and enthusiasm the Scottish soldiers were raised, by this display of personal courage and feat of arms, enacted on that bright summer noon, in plain view of the English and Scottish troops. It is said that King Robert met the reproaches of his barons by observing that it was indeed a pity he had broken his good battle-axe.

While Gloucester menaced the front of the Scottish position, he detached 300 English men-at-arms under Sir Robert de Clifford,\* to circle round the left of their line and, by keeping the low ground near the Forth, to establish communications with the garrison of Stirling. Bruce, with the true instinct of a soldier, had foreseen some such movement, and had given strict orders to Randolph to be on his guard to intercept it. The exact position occupied by Randolph on this day has been the subject of much uncertainty. It would seem more natural that the duty of watching the approach to Stirling by the carse should have been entrusted to Douglas and the Steward, commanding the left divi-

---

\* Hailes endorses Barbour's figure of 800, but Sir Thomas Gray, whose father rode with de Clifford, mentions only 300.—*Scala-cronica*, 141.

sion in the line, and therefore nearest to the carse. But the left division lay on lower ground than the others, and Randolph was probably stationed on Coxet Hill, slightly in rear of the general line, while the King held a position rather in advance, on the Borestone Hill.\* From the last-named elevation a view can be had of the carse down a hollow in the ground, and, looking down this, Bruce suddenly perceived what trees and rising ground concealed from Randolph on Coxet Hill, namely, a body of English cavalry passing northward beyond the left flank of the Scots.

Instantly the King sent a sharp reproach to his nephew, Randolph, telling him that he had "let fall a rose from his chaplet," and bidding him keep better watch. Randolph, stung by the taunt, proceeded to execute a manœuvre which it would be impossible to understand without Gray's explanation of it. It has generally been supposed that Randolph set out with cavalry to overtake de Clifford; and certainly it would have been a hopeless task to intercept the English horse with foot-soldiers. But in the whole Scottish army there were but 500 cavalry, under the command of Sir Robert de Keith, and these took no part in the fighting on Sunday. The true explanation is to be found in the eagerness of the English knights. De Clifford and de Beaumont were mak-

\* The perforated stone, whence this hill takes its name, is said to have supported the royal standard during the battle. Most likely it did so on the Saturday and Sunday, for the hill is a fine post of observation; but, as will be shown, the position was somewhat altered before the general engagement.



ing good progress through the plain between Old Polmaise and Livilands, and, believing that they had escaped observation, saw the way clear before them into Stirling. Suddenly they observed Randolph leaving the wood and moving parallel to them on the higher ground to their left, apparently with his whole division (*issist du boys od sa batail*).

"Wait a little!" cried Sir Henry de Beaumont, "let them come on; let them out on the plain."

"Sir," said Sir Thomas Gray, "I doubt they are too many for us."

"Look you!" retorted de Beaumont, "if you are afraid you can retreat."

"Sir!" answered Gray, indignantly, "it is not for fear that I shall retire this day" (*Sire! pur pour ne fueray ieo huy*).

With these words he ranged his horse between de Beaumont and Sir William d'Eyncourt, and charged the Scots. Randolph received the heavy cavalry in the usual formation of a dense oval or square, each front rank man having the butt of his pike firmly planted in the ground between his knees. Charge after charge recoiled from the hedge of steel. D'Eyncourt fell dead at the first onslaught; Sir Thomas Gray's horse was impaled on the pikes, and the rider taken prisoner. His son observes, in his sorrowful narrative, that the Scots had learnt how to fight on foot from the Flemings, who in that manner had discomfited the chivalry of France at Courtray.

When Douglas saw the gallant young Randolph leave the shelter of the wood for the open field, he feared for the advantage that manœuvre would give

the heavy cavalry, and he implored the King to let him go to the rescue. Bruce wisely refused to derange his order of battle in presence of the enemy, and forbade him to leave his ground. But whether, as Barbour alleges, the King in the end gave a reluctant consent, or whether, as is more likely, Douglas took matters into his own hands, he led a force to support Randolph. But the work had been done before he could arrive. De Clifford's men had suffered severely in repeated repulses, and were fallen into great disorder, while the Scots still showed an unbroken front—"as ane hyrcheoun"—like a hedgehog. Douglas, unwilling to deprive a young soldier of credit in this affair, halted his men; and the English, finding themselves in the presence of fresh troops, took to flight, some to Stirling Castle, others back the way they came.

This conflict took place on a piece of ground which is still called Randolph's Field, at the south end of Melville Terrace, Stirling. Two large stones, about a hundred yards to the west of the present high road, mark the spot where the Scottish square received De Clifford's charge.

After the double reverse thus inflicted on his arms, Gloucester, finding that he was not supported by the main body of English, abandoned the attack and retreated to Edward's bivouacking ground.

The speeches which chroniclers are wont to put in the mouths of their heroes are not worthy of much credence. No doubt Bruce did address his leaders on the eve of battle, and perhaps to much the same effect as Barbour professes to report verbatim, and

as, in later days, it was paraphrased in the stirring verse of Burns. But for historical purposes it would be as idle to dwell on what were supposed to be his actual words, as to accept as authentic the miracle of St. Fillan's arm, recorded by Boece, though on this subject Barbour is prudently silent. It is not, however improbable that the King of Scots did, as was reported, cause this sacred relic to be brought from the priory of Strathfillan, its shrine in Perthshire, into his camp, trusting to its influence, if not on the fortune of war at least on the imagination of his soldiers. The fable may be repeated here from Bellenden's translation of Boece, as an example of the myths which have their birth in ages when the border between faith and superstition is ill-defined.

"All the nicht afore the batall, K. Robert was right wery, havand gret solicitude for the weil of his army, and nicht tak na rest, but rolland \* all jeoperdeis and chance of fortoun in his mind; and sum times he went to his devoit contemplatioun, makand his orisoun to Sanct Phillane, quhais † arme, as he believit, set in silver, was closit in ane cais within his palyeon ‡: traisting the better fortoun to, follow be the samin. § In the mene time, the cais chakkit to || sud-danlie, but \*\* ony motion or werk of mortall creaturis. The preist, astonist be this wonder, went to the altar quhair †† the cais lay; and quhen he fand the arme in the cais, he cryit, 'Heir is ane gret mirakle!' and incontinent he confessit how he brocht the tume †† cais in the feild, dredaned §§ that the rellik suld be tint ||| in the feild, quhair sa gret jeoperdeis apperit. The king, rejosing of this mirakill, past the remanent nicht in his prayaris with gud esperance of victorie."

\* Revolving.

† Whose.

‡ Pavilion, tent.

§ By the same.

|| Closed with a snap.

\*\* Without.

†† Where.

‡‡ Empty.

§§ Dreading.

||| Lost.

Of far greater interest is another incident of this night, reported by Sir Thomas Gray, from the testimony of his father, then a prisoner in the Scottish camp. He says that the Scottish leaders were satisfied that enough had been gained on that Sunday to justify them in beating a retreat without dishonour, before the overwhelming numbers of the English. They had kept the appointed tryst, met and defeated their foes in the open field, and their King had slain the English champion. The requirements of the chivalrous code had been amply satisfied, and Bruce was free once more to resort to his usual strategy of wasting the country and making it impossible for a hostile army to maintain existence therein. But just as they were on the point of abandoning their lines and marching to the wild district of the Lennox, on the west of Stirling, Sir Alexander de Seton, a Scottish knight in the English service, having deserted King Edward's camp, rode to Bruce's tent in the wood, and told him that if ever he meant to be King of Scotland, now was his time: "for," said he "the English have lost heart and are disconcerted; they are dreading a sudden assault." He described the disposition of their forces, and pledged his life that if Bruce attacked them next morning, he would vanquish them without fail.

Barbour is the sole authority for yet another incident of this eventful Sunday evening. David Earl of Athol owed special ill-will to Edward de Brus, the husband of his sister Isabel, because Edward neglected her in favour of the sister of Sir Walter de Ros, whom he loved "*per amouris*." Athol, there-

fore, made an attack upon the Scottish commissariat at Cambuskenneth, slaying Sir John of Airth and some of the guards. Lord Hailes assumes that this was a deed of treachery, but it is doubtful if Athol ever was in the service of King Robert. Hailes, without quoting authority, states that he joined the Scottish cause in 1313; but he was under English command at Dundee in 1311,\* attended Parliament at Westminster in December, 1312, † and in October, 1314, received lands in England to recoup him for those he had lost in Scotland.‡ So if he ever joined Bruce, it could only have been for a few months previous to Bannockburn, and, on the appearance of King Edward north of the Border, he attached himself to what seemed the stronger side.

An English chronicler is chiefly responsible for the statement that King Edward's troops passed the night of Sunday 23d in revelry. "You might have seen," says Sir Thomas de la More, "the English in the fore part of the night drunk with wine in manner most unlike the English, belching forth their debauch, and shouting wassail and drinkhail with extraordinary noise. The Scots on the other hand, kept the sacred vigil in fasting and silence, burning with the love of their country and of freedom." This is confirmed by the following doggerel couplet from the poem of one Baston, a Carmelite friar, who accompanied the English army in order to celebrate its triumph. But having fallen prisoner into the hands

---

\* Bain, iii., 404.

† *Ibid.*, 59.

‡ *Ibid.*, 75.

of the Scots, he proved the versatility of his Muse, and at the same time purchased his ransom, by turning his poem, most of which probably was already in manuscript, into a pæan of victory for the arms of Bruce.

“Dum se sic jactant cum Baccho nocte jocando,  
Scotia, te mactant, verbis vanis reprobando.”

It was a common thing, as attested by numerous entries in the records, for commanders to serve out liquor to their men before a battle, and perhaps King Robert would have done the like, if he had possessed the means.

If the King of Scots really had decided, as Sir Thomas Gray affirms, to evacuate his position, he changed his mind on receiving the intelligence conveyed by Sir Alexander de Seton, and resolved to await the attack of the English.

At dawn on St. John's day mass was celebrated in the Scottish lines by the Abbot of Inchaffray. Then the men broke their fast, and the King conferred knighthood on James of Douglas and Walter the Steward.\* At sunrise, or shortly after, the Scottish army moved out of the woods† and took up the alignment chosen by the King, the divisions

\* It is difficult to suppose that these two officers, each holding important command in the Scottish army, had remained simple esquires up to this time. No doubt they were knights already, and the further honour now conferred raised them to the rank of knights banneret, which could only be created on the field of battle.

† “Tuk the plane full apertly.”—*The Brus*, c. 15.

“Tinrent reddement lour chemyn deuers lost dez Engles.” *Scalacronica*, 142.

being in the formation called "*en schiltrome*." \* The position seems to have been slightly different to that occupied on the previous day, † and it is doubtful if the Borestone Hill was occupied by more than a vedette. The right division, under Edward de Brus, held the higher ground between Gray Stale and New Park, its right flank resting on the Bannock, at the point where its banks become precipitous. The central division, under Randolph, lay along the north-west extremity of Halbert's Bog; and the left division, under the Steward and Douglas, posted on the slopes nearest to St. Ninian's church. ‡ The left and centre lay along the lines now marked by the road between Gray Stale and St. Ninian's. The reserve, consisting of the men of Carrick and Argyll, with the Islanders under Sir Angus of Bute, was held in command of King Robert in person, in rear of the general line. In military language, the whole army was in echelon by the right: that is to say—the centre was thrown back from the right, and the left from the centre. The non-combatants—camp-followers, baggage guard, and servants—were sent

\* A military term used by Gray and Barbour to express the formation of infantry in a dense column, which could be turned into a square to resist cavalry by halting, facing the rear ranks to the right-about, and turning the flank sections outwards.

† In analysing the position of the Scottish army, I have had the advantage of studying a paper drawn up by Major (now General Sir Evelyn) Wood, who critically inspected the ground in 1872.

‡ The site of this church is marked by the tower of one erected long after the date of the battle. The building of which this tower formed part, was used by Charles Edward's troops in 1746 as a powder magazine, and blown up by them on their retreat.

to the rear, and hidden in a glen on the ground still known as Gillies' Hill.\*

While the Scottish divisions were taking up their positions, the English host came in view, making a magnificent and brilliant display in the morning sunlight. Edward's new favourite, Hugh le Despenser, was in his train; not better liked by the barons than the last one, if we may believe Sir Thomas de la More, who alludes to him as *vecors ille milvus*—that cowardly kite. There were in attendance also several bishops and other ecclesiastics. It is said that King Edward, when he saw the mean array opposed to him, lacking in all the gorgeous heraldry and splendid armour which blazed over his own columns, asked his attendants if these men really meant to fight. There were riding at his bridle the Earl of Pembroke and Sir Giles de Argentine, reputed the third knight in Christendom; but it was Sir Ingelram de Umfraville who made reply, saying that they assuredly would fight, and added the advice that the English should make a feint of retiring, so as to tempt the Scots into pursuit. He knew his countrymen too well to doubt that they would break away from their position as soon as they believed the English were in retreat, in spite of all their officers might do. Once get them out of the formidable "schiltrome" formation and they would be completely at the mercy of the better equipped and mounted English.

But King Edward would none of his advice; he was too proud even to affect to retire before such

---

\* Meaning "the Servants' Hill"; from the Gaelic *giola*, a servant.



ragged rabble, and well was it for Bruce that his troops were spared this trial to their steadiness.


"See!" cried King Edward, "am I not right? they kneel for mercy." For at that moment the Abbot of Inchaffray was moving along the front of the Scottish lines, bearing aloft the crucifix, and each division knelt as he passed.

"You speak sooth now, Sire!" said Sir Ingelram, gravely, "they crave mercy, but not from you. It is God's mercy they implore. Those men will never fly: they will win all or die."

"Now be it so!" quoth Edward, who, after all was the son of *Malleus Scottorum*; "we shall see."

Then he bade the trumpets sound "Advance!"

Now became apparent the sagacity shown by the King of Scots in his choice of position. The ground near Caldan Hill being impracticable, the main advance of the English had to be directed between Parkmill and Charters Hall. A body of 500 men-at-arms under the Earl of Gloucester rode before the nine English divisions, and led the attack on the Scottish right. But owing to the cramped nature of the ground, they could not attempt to deploy, until they were actually on the Scottish line. Moreover, as Sir Thomas de la More mentions, they were thrown into great disarray by the covered pits with which the King of Scots had protected the right of his line. In spite, however, of these difficulties, the English horsemen pressed on, their advance being covered by a cloud of archers, who made their way where the heavy cavalry could not pass. The Scots, ever greatly inferior to the Eng-



### FIELD OF BANNOCKBURN.

- The King of Scots, commanding the Scottish reserve  
 Scottish Divisions.  
 I Right Division, under Edward de Brus.  
 II Centre Division, under Randolph.  
 III Left Division, under Douglas & Walter the Steward.  
 K 500 light horse, under Sir Robert de Keith, sent to disperse English archers.  
 B Baggage train.  
 R Randolph's encounter with de Clifford's and de Beaumont's cavalry.

- The King of England.  
 English Divisions, thrown into confusion by the nature of the ground, attempting to cross the Bannock and deploy.  
 Gloucester's heavy cavalry charging English archers playing on Edward de Brus's flank.  
 Cavalry under de Clifford and de Beaumont, sent forward on June 25<sup>th</sup> to communicate with Stirling Castle.



lish in archery, also extended their bowmen; but these were quickly driven in.\*

The brunt of the fighting was borne by Edward de Brus's division on the right. While he was resisting the repeated charges of English heavy cavalry in front, the archers swarmed into the broken ground on his right, and poured a galling fire upon his flank. The position was critical. Behind the cavalry, the whole weight of the English columns was pressing forward, though greatly hampered by want of room. In vain the gallant Gloucester strove to break that iron "schiltrome." His horse fell disembowelled by the cruel pikes, and, according to some accounts, it was here this brave knight met a soldier's death. The English could not deploy to their right, because of Halbert's Bog, which protected the Scottish centre; Randolph, therefore, was free to take ground to his right and thereby support Edward de Brus. Still, the Scots were falling fast under the fire of archers; and the moment had come for King Robert to make masterly use of his small body of cavalry under Sir Robert de Keith. He sent that knight with his whole force of 500 horse round the right rear, to take the English archers in flank. Keith was completely successful.† He charged the sharpshooters with great spirit, scattered them like chaff, and Edward de Brus was free to concentrate his attention on the enemy in front.

\* *Lanercost*, 225.

† Lord Hailes pronounces Keith's charge to have been decisive of the battle.

By this time King Robert had moved up his reserve into the first line, taking the place vacated by Randolph in closing towards Edward de Brus. The whole ground from Parkmill to the north-west corner of Halbert's Bog, about half a mile square, was crowded with English, rapidly falling into disorder. Wounded chargers plunged madly down among them from the *mêlée* in front, while the pressure of the advancing columns behind increased every moment. Once more the Scottish archers came into play, this time with murderous effect, and the slaughter on this part of the field was terrific. The splendid English array was getting into hopeless confusion—hopeless, because their immense numbers made it impossible to restore order among them. Men jammed into one mass of living, dead, and dying, cannot obey orders, be they never so clearly delivered. At this critical moment there occurred a circumstance, probably unpremeditated, which decided the fortunes of the day. The camp-followers had been watching the struggle from the security of Gillies' Hill. They had seen the Scottish columns repel Gloucester's cavalry, had heard their victorious cheers, and could discern the tumult in the English ranks. Far from yielding a foot, the divisions of Edward de Brus and Randolph had rather advanced, and the King had led his reserve into the thick of the fighting. Assuredly the field was won, and the moment for plunder had arrived. The rascals sprang to their feet and, waving flags extemporised out of blankets and tent-poles, rushed down the hillside with loud cheers. The English

mistook them for fresh troops, and began to give ground; the rearward movement became a rout, the rout a panic, and then a fearful scene of butchery ensued. About a mile and a half from the field, to the south of Bannockburn House, is a place still called the Bloody Fauld, where a body of English rallied and made a determined stand. They all perished. According to some accounts it was here, and not near Parkmill, that Gloucester met his death.

The English King had witnessed the action from the elevation of Charters Hall, nearly opposite the Scottish right. He was very nearly captured. Some Scottish knights, fighting on foot, seized the trappings of his war horse, but Edward stoutly defended himself with his mace, felling several of his assailants.\* His horse was disembowelled, but a fresh one was brought up for him, and Pembroke laying his hand on the reins, told him all was lost and that he must fly. Sir Giles de Argentine, his other attendant, said :

“Sire, I was placed in charge of your rein: seek your own safety. There is your castle of Stirling, where your body may be in safety, For myself—I am not accustomed to fly; nor shall I do so now. I commend you to God!”

Setting spurs to his horse, he charged into the thick of Edward de Brus's square, shouting, “Argentine! Argentine!” and fell, pierced with many wounds.

How many of the English rank and file perished

\* *Scalacronica*, 142.

on the field will never be known; nor can it be guessed in proportion to the losses among those of gentler degree, because allowance has to be made for the custom of mediæval war, whereby the lives of nobles and knights were tenderly preserved when that was possible, in view of the price that their ransom would bring the captors. The common soldiers received no such consideration. Twenty-one English barons and bannerets were slain, including such renowned commanders as the Earl of Gloucester, nephew of King Edward, the veteran de Clifford, Sir Giles de Argentine, and Sir Edmund de Mauley, the Marshal of England, who was drowned in the Bannock, John Comyn, also, and Sir Pagan de Typ-toft. Forty-two knights perished, and sixty were taken; among the slain being Sir Henry de Bohun, Sir John de Harcourt, and Sir Philip de Courtenay. The number of other gentlemen of coat-armour who lost their lives on the Sunday and Monday is put by the English chroniclers at the enormous figure of seven hundred.\*

The prisoners taken included twenty-two barons and bannerets, among whom were the Earls of Hereford † and Angus, Sir Ingelram de Umfraville, Sir Thomas Gray, Sir Antony de Lucy, and Sir Thomas de Boutetourt. Sixty knights and several clerics were also among the prisoners. Many of the English of all ranks had sought refuge in the crags of Stirling. King Robert detached a force to dislodge them, on which they all surrendered.

\* *Scutiferorum septingentorum.*—Walsingham.

† Taken at Bothwell Castle some days later.

If the statement, commonly accepted by historians, be authentic, that 30,000 perished on the field and in the flight, then about one half of Edward's army must have been slaughtered—an unusual proportion even in the greatest disasters. No doubt the common soldiers fared miserably in their flight. Sir Maurice de Berkeley, in command of the Welsh, led them towards the Border; but the countrymen rose and slew many of them in detail among the moors. *Væ victis!* the power of England was shattered for the time, and none may reckon the amount of individual disaster.

The King of England rode with Aymer de Valence and a body-guard of five hundred, to the gate of Stirling Castle, and claimed shelter. But Sir Philip de Moubray implored him to hold on his way, for the castle must needs be surrendered, and so the King would fall into the hands of the enemy. Edward set off accordingly, making a detour, probably through the woods to the west of the castle and battlefield, and galloped away for Linlithgow. Sir James Douglas getting word of this, went to King Robert and obtained leave to give chase with sixty horse, which were all that could be spared. On his way he met Sir Laurence de Abernethy with a following of fourscore, hastening to join the English army; who, on hearing news of the great defeat, promptly changed sides, and joined in the pursuit.

King Edward's escort halted at Winchburgh to bait, but it was too strong for Douglas to offer attack. He had to be content with hanging closely on the flanks of the body-guard as far as Dunbar,



where the Earl of March opened his friendly gates, and received the King into safety.\* From Dunbar Edward escaped in a small boat to Berwick,† whence he published a humiliating document on June 27th, announcing the loss of his signet, of which the keeper, Roger de Northburgh, with his two clerks, had been taken prisoner, and warning all persons against obeying orders issued under it. The King of Scots, however, was a foe too chivalrous to take unfair advantage of his opportunity; he returned the seal to Edward, on condition that it should not be used.

In like manner as Fordun attributed the victory of the Scots to the piety of their King, "who put his trust, not in a host of people, but in the Lord God," and conquered through the help of Him to whom it belongeth to give the victory," so Sir Thomas de la More ascribed King Edward's escape to the direct intervention of the Virgin, "for," says he, "it was not the speed of a horse nor craft of man that delivered the King from his enemies, but the Mother of God whom he invoked. He vowed to her and her Son that, if he escaped, he would build a house for poor Carmelites, dedicated to the Mother of God, to be used by twenty-four students of theology.

\* Barbour describes the closeness of the pursuit in language so vivid, that Lord Hailes took refuge in Latin to convey the poet's illustration. Perhaps it is obscure enough in its antique English to endure quotation in the original.

"And he was alwais by them ner,  
He let tham nocht haf sic laser  
As anis water for to ma."—*The Brus*, cix., 55.

† *Lanercost*, 227.

This vow he afterwards fulfilled at Oxford, and provided the expenses, notwithstanding the remonstrance of Hugh le Despenser." Such was the origin of Oriel College.

De Valence, Earl of Pembroke having seen King Edward safely off the battle-field, did not accompany him in his flight. Probably his horse was killed, for he escaped on foot, and made his way to Carlisle.

There remains to be mentioned the loss suffered by the victors in this great battle. It was insignificant compared with that of the English. The only knights of renown who are known to have fallen were Sir William de Vipont and Sir Walter de Ros. The last-named was Edward de Brus's dearest friend, and the brother of his paramour, Isabel de Ros.\*

---

\* Edward obtained a dispensation to marry Isabel de Ros, by whom he had a son Alexander; but it was only dated June 1, 1317, a few months before his death, so it is not likely that the marriage ever took place.





Sir Humphrey de Bohun.



Sir Philip de Moubray.

## CHAPTER X.

### INVASION OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND BY THE SCOTS.

A.D. 1314-1317.

SIR PHILIP DE MOUBRAY delivered up his command of Stirling Castle, according to stipulation, and entered the service of the King of Scots.

The English historian, Walsingham, will not be suspected of partiality for the victors of Bannockburn; the greater weight therefore is carried by his testimony to the merciful treatment of the prisoners by King Robert, who thereby won the affection of many who had fought against him. According to the custom of war, a proportion of the prisoners taken in a general action were credited to the commander-in-chief, to whom their ransom should be payable. Among those thus allotted to the King's share were his relative, Sir Marmaduke de Twenge, and his old friend, Sir Ralph de Monthermer, both of whom he released unconditionally. Sir Marma-



BOTHWELL CASTLE, THE QUADRANGLE.  
*(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)*



duke, seeing no chance of escape from the field, lay hidden all night in the woods. Next day when King Robert went forth to survey the scene of the battle, the knight came forward and knelt before him. The King greeted him kindly and asked to whom he yielded himself prisoner. "To none save your Majesty," answered Sir Marmaduke. "Then I receive you," said Bruce, and afterwards entertained him hospitably, and sent him back to England with a handsome present. Sir Ralph had carried King Edward's shield or scale in the battle, and accompanied him in his flight from the field, but, falling behind, was captured by Douglas's men. Bruce allowed him to carry Edward's shield back to England. The bodies of Gloucester and de Clifford he sent to England for honourable burial.

The Earl of Hereford, the Earl of Angus, Sir John de Segrave, Sir Ingelram de Umfraville, and Sir Antony de Lucy found their way to Bothwell Castle on the Clyde,\* almost the only Scottish fortress still flying the English flag. Soon afterwards they were besieged by Edward de Brus and capitulated. Three months later, on October 2d, Hereford obtained his release in exchange for the Queen of Scots and her two daughters, the Bishop of Glasgow and the young Earl of Mar.† King Robert had been parted from his wife and daughters for eight years.

\* *Lanercost*, 228.

† Bain, iii., 74. The Queen had been removed in March from Barking Abbey to Rochester Castle, where she was allowed 20s. a week for her expenses.

Fordun exults over the vast sums obtained for the ransom of other nobles and knights taken prisoners. "The whole land of Scotland," he says, "overflowed with boundless wealth."

His crushing defeat, the loss of all his stores, the capture or death of many of his best generals, and, above all, the terrible loss of English prestige, might have disposed Edward, had he been a wiser monarch or surrounded by wiser counsellors, to begin negotiations for peace as soon as he was safe at York. But there is nothing to show that he entertained the idea. His borders were left without defence, and King Robert, having at command such active lieutenants as his brother Edward, on whom he had bestowed his own earldom of Carrick, and the Black Douglas, was not likely to neglect his opportunity. He sent Carrick, Douglas, and de Soulis to invade Northumberland in the beginning of August. They wasted the whole of that county; the unhappy farmers being doomed to see their ripening crops trodden to mire or burned, and all their live-stock driven away. The ecclesiastical registers of Carlisle, Durham, and York contain letters presenting a piteous memorial of the terrors of this and the succeeding years. The bishoprick of Durham bought immunity from fire, at least, by paying a heavy indemnity; but the Scots penetrated Yorkshire as far as Teesdale, and returned by Appleby and Coupland, which they burnt.

On September 9th, King Edward assembled his Parliament at York. The Earl of Pembroke was appointed Guardian of the country between Trent and Tweed. Letters were considered, brought by

Ralph Chilton, a friar, from the King of Scots, expressing his earnest desire for a lasting peace between the two nations, and asking for a safe-conduct for the following commissioners to treat for the same—Sir Nigel Campbell, Sir Roger de Kirkpatrick, Sir Robert de Keith, and Sir Gilbert de la Haye. The required passports were made out, and commissioners were appointed to represent England; but although a conference between the two parties actually took place at Dumfries, the proceedings came to nought, probably owing to the refusal of the English commissioners to pay royal honours to the name of King Robert. On November 26th, and again on December 26th, the Archbishop of York wrote to various knights and ecclesiastics, bidding them prepare for fresh invasion, as the negotiations for truce had failed.\* His prediction was immediately fulfilled, for the Scots once more poured across the Border, and forced the sorely harassed people of Tyne-dale to do homage to King Robert. No assistance from the central government could be hoped for, because Edward was involved again in strife with his barons, so the English dalesmen were left to organise such resistance as they could under the direction of the warlike Archbishop, and the bishops of Carlisle and Durham. It was not very effective; many were made captives and held to ransom. The county of Cumberland paid 800 marks for a truce to last from Christmas, 1314, to Midsummer Day, 1315.† Among the papers in the register of Durham

\* Raine, 233, 237.

† *Lanercost*, 230.



is the record of a pathetic incident. It is the inquest on the body of an unhappy countryman who, having climbed the church tower of Houghton-le-Spring in order to have a better view of the Scots passing over the plain below, fell down from under the bells and was killed. To the verdict of accidental death was added a rider, which must have been very consolatory to the parishioners who had lost all their possessions, to the effect that, although the floor of the tower had undoubtedly been polluted by the blood of the deceased, the jury did not consider that there was any reason to interrupt the ordinary services in the church.\*

All these ransoms and indemnities had made the King of Scots strong in the sinews of war, and he prepared to extend the area of operations. The O'Neills of Ulster had been making overtures to him, complaining of the exactions of their English rulers, and offering the crown of Ireland to Edward, Earl of Carrick. In consequence of this an expedition was resolved on, which seems to one looking back on those distant days the sole blunder committed by Robert the Bruce from the day he finally took up the cause of Scottish independence. There was fighting and rapine enough in Britain, God knows, to satisfy a nature far more ferocious than that of the King of Scots, without seeking more in other lands. Yet, before committing himself to what proved such a disastrous enterprise, Robert must have weighed the advantage of dividing the English forces against the prudence of dividing his own.

---

\* Raine, 249.

Besides, a crown was a crown in those days. Great must have been the temptation to provide so fitting a reward for his brother's priceless services. Bruce had accomplished already, in securing the Scottish crown, a far heavier piece of work than seemed to lie between him and the conquest of Ireland ; while, from a strategic point of view, it would be no trifling advantage thus to plant on the flank of England a power friendly to Scotland.

The expedition went forward. The Earl of Carrick landed at Carrickfergus on May 25, 1315, with 6000 men and some of the best knights in Scotland. Among these were the King's two nephews, Randolph, Earl of Moray, and John, son of Sir Nigel Campbell of Lochow, Sir Philip de Moubray, lately King Edward's governor at Stirling, Sir John de Soulis, and Sir John de Menteith.

Before they started King Robert assembled a Parliament at Ayr on Sunday, April 25, 1315. The chief business before it was urgent enough, being the settlement of the succession to the throne, for the King had at this time only one child, the Princess Marjorie, and his own mode of life during the last nine years had been the reverse of conducive to longevity.

It was enacted that, should the King die without heirs male, the succession should devolve on Edward, Earl of Carrick, and his heirs male ; whom failing, on Princess Marjorie. In the event of a minor succeeding under this disposition, the Earl of Moray was to be guardian of the heir and the kingdom. Should all these heirs fail, then Moray was to be

guardian of the realm, till the prelates and magnates of Scotland should determine the succession.

The choice made by King Robert of a husband for his daughter was a momentous one, affecting, as it afterwards turned out, the dynasties of both the Scottish and English thrones to a very remote posterity. Walter, High Steward of Scotland, was the knight selected as a consort for the Princess; but their married life was brief indeed, for Marjorie died in her first confinement, on March 2, 1316, leaving a son, afterwards Robert II. of Scotland.

On the return of the ships which conveyed the army to Ireland, King Robert fitted them out for a fresh expedition to the western islands, which he visited in company with his son-in-law the Steward. As Barbour is the only authority for this excursion, and as his statement that John of Lorn was made prisoner in the course of it is now known to be contrary to fact, importance need not be attached to his account of the events of these early summer months. But it is probably true that about this time the King received the submission of the islanders without much difficulty. While passing through Dunbarton in April, he granted the privilege of garth or sanctuary to Malcolm, Earl of Lennox, in reward for his timely help in bygone days of adversity. \*

The various truces purchased by the English bishops expired on the first anniversary of Bannockburn—St. John's Day, June 24, 1315. The Archbishop of York had held a council of war at Doncaster on the Monday after Ascension Day, to devise means

---

\* *The Lennox*, by William Fraser, i., 236.

to put the Border in a state of defence\*; but it does not seem that it profited much, for on June 29th Douglas led a raid through the county of Durham, and occupied the town of Hartlepool, the inhabitants seeking safety in their shipping. There was no burning,† but such booty as had escaped former forays was secured.

On July 22d, the King of Scots in person began the siege of Carlisle, a town against which he cherished a stern purpose of revenge, as the scene of the ignominious death of his brothers Thomas and Alexander, in 1306. The castle was held by a knight of great renown, Sir Andrew de Harcla. The Franciscan chronicler of Lanercost has left a minute account of the siege, of which he must have been an involuntary witness. It lasted eleven days, on each of which assaults were made on one of the three gates, or all three simultaneously. But the citizens worked gallantly with the garrison in defence, keeping the assailants at bay with showers of stones and flights of arrows. The Scots made a huge machine wherewith to hurl stones against the gates; the defenders made seven or eight similar ones. The garrison had also springalds for firing darts, and with these and other devices they wrought great mischief among the besiegers. Then the Scots built a great wooden tower on wheels, tall enough to overtop the walls; whereupon the English built a taller one. But the Scottish engine never came into play, sticking fast in the mud of the moat. Wheeled bridges, too,

---

\* Raine, 246.

† *Lanercost*, 230.

which they attempted to throw across the ditches, fell into the water and sank ; and attempts to fill the ditches with green corn cut in the neighbourhood failed also.

At last all mechanical siege appliances having broken down, King Robert resolved to carry the place by sheer force of muscle and cold iron. On the ninth and tenth days a general attack was delivered, chiefly against the eastern side of the citadel. On the tenth day, the attention of the garrison being, it was hoped, concentrated on this part, Douglas took an escalading party to the west side, opposite the house of the Minorite friars, where a sally port may still be seen. Here the Scots actually got over the walls, but encountered more resistance than they had reckoned on. The ladders, crowded with men, were flung down ; many were killed, and Douglas had to beat a retreat, leaving some prisoners in the hands of the English.

The siege was suddenly raised on August 1st, when the Scots, alarmed, it would seem, by the approach of an English force, decamped, leaving all their rude siege appliances behind them. Brave Sir Andrew de Harcla then sallied from his fortress, hung on the flanks of the retreating Scots, and made two very important prisoners, to wit, John de Moray and Sir Robert Bardolf, "a man," observes the friar, "of the worst possible disposition to Englishmen." John de Moray was a valuable prize ; he had distinguished himself at Bannockburn, and received as his share a number of the prisoners taken there, whom he held to ransom. For the capture of these two warriors,

Sir Andrew received a guerdon of 1000 marks from his King, but it will be seen presently that this was not the last move in the game.

The only satisfaction gained by the Scots in this campaign was such as they might derive from having thoroughly burnt and wasted Allerdale, Coupland, and Westmorland, and plundered the churches of Egremont and St. Bees.

On January 10, 1316, the King of Scots and Douglas, made a night attack on Berwick.\* There was at that time no wall between the Brighthouse and the castle, and the Scots, attacking simultaneously by land and sea, came very near capturing the town. But the moon was bright that night; the assailants were detected and repulsed, with the loss of Sir John de Landells, Douglas himself escaping with difficulty in a small boat.

Nevertheless, the position of Berwick was becoming desperate. The successful defence of Carlisle had been owing as much to the foresight and activity of the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Durham in providing supplies, as to the gallantry of its commander and garrison. Without stores the bravest soldiers must succumb, and the indifference shown by Edward to reiterated complaints of the shocking scarcity in Berwick, can only be accounted for by the increasing confusion of his own affairs. For Berwick was not only a fortress of the first importance, but it was one into which supplies could easily be thrown from the sea. Perhaps the blame should rest chiefly with Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pem-

---

\* *Lanercost.*

broke, who continued guardian of the northern English counties till August, 1315, and was responsible for the defences of the Border. His performance throughout the Scottish war, from the moment that he allowed Bruce to slip through his fingers in Glen-trool, and suffered defeat at London Hill, had dimmed the lustre of this celebrated knight's earlier renown. He had been, at all events, almost uniformly unsuccessful.\*

In February and March, 1316, Sir Maurice de Berkeley, Governor of Berwick, wrote to King Edward to say that his soldiers were actually dying of starvation on the walls. Whenever a horse died, the men-at-arms boiled and ate it, not allowing the foot-soldiers a mouthful till they themselves had eaten all they wanted. He assured the King that the town must be lost unless relief speedily came.† On February 14th the garrison mutinied, and a party of Gascons, setting the Governor's orders at defiance, for they vowed it was better to die fighting than to starve, rode on a foray in Tweeddale.

Sir Adam de Gordon, who had joined the Scottish service after Bannockburn, detected them on their return march, driving a lot of cattle before them. He reported the circumstance to Douglas, who took the field at once with Sir William de Soulis, Sir Henry de Balliol, and a small troop of horse, and rode to intercept the raiders at Scaithmoor, in the

\* Born in 1280, Pembroke at this period was just at his prime as a soldier. Piers Gaveston, with whom he was no favourite, had nicknamed him Joseph the Jew, because of his sallow complexion.

† Bain, iii., 89.

parish of Coldstream. The Gascons seeing the Scots approach, sent forward the cattle in charge of some countrymen, and at once formed the "schiltrome." \* But the Scots charged them with such fury that their formation gave way, and they were scattered with the loss of 20 men-at-arms and 60 foot. Contemporary letters, preserved in the Tower collection, confirm in a remarkable way Barbour's accuracy in recording this affair. The only mistake he makes is in calling Raimond Caillu, a Gascon who was killed, Ewmond de Caliou, and in styling him governor of Berwick instead of King's sergeant-at-arms. He says that this was the hardest bit of fighting Douglas ever had to do, and perhaps he was right, for the starving Gascons would stand stoutly and strike shrewdly for their half-won dinners.

Midsummer, 1316, saw the Scots once more over the Border. It was a season of great famine and scarcity, and no wonder, so long had the energies of both countries been diverted from peaceful occupation. The Scots, under a leader whose name has not been preserved, penetrated as far as Richmond in Yorkshire, while King Edward held his court at York. The town of Richmond bought off the invaders, who marched thence 60 miles to the west, destroying and burning everything in their way, till they came to Furness, hitherto unvisited by any raiders, where they made great spoil. They were especially delighted at the abundance of iron there, a commodity of which Scotland produced very little at that time.

Edward de Brus, Earl of Carrick, had by this time

---

\* *The Brus*, cxviii., 42.



been campaigning in Ireland for more than a year. The horrors of that warfare lie beyond the limits of this narrative, but those who have a mind to realise the sufferings of the unhappy inhabitants, alternately inflicted by the English under the Earl of Ulster, brother of the Queen of Scotland, and by the Scots under the Earl of Carrick, brother of the King of Scotland, may gratify their curiosity by consulting the *Annals of Clonmacnoise*. The sequence of the chief events was as follows: Carrick, who received the support of the native chiefs of Ulster, having wasted the lands of all English settlers in the north, stormed and burnt Dundalk, on June 29, 1315. The Earl of Ulster, allied with the native King of Connaught, marched against the invaders, destroying the lands of all who supported the Scots. The two armies met at Conyers, on September 10th: the English were defeated, and de Brus laid siege to Carrickfergus. On December 6th the siege was raised, and the Scots marched south through Meath into Kildare, defeating a superior force at Kenlis under Roger, Lord Mortimer.\* On January 20, 1316, de Brus encountered Edmund Butler, the justiciar of Ireland, at Arscoll in Kildare, and again put the English to flight, though on this occasion also the Scots were far inferior in numbers. Two Scottish knights of distinction, Fergus of Ardrossan and Walter de Moray, fell in this action.

---

\* Lord Hailes, with some hesitation, assigns a later date to this battle, but a letter from Sir John de Hothum to Edward II., written from Dublin on February 15, 1316, sets the true date beyond dispute. —Bain, iii., Introduction, xxiv., and p. 89.

Twice during this campaign, in September, 1315, and March, 1316, the Earl of Moray had occasion to return to Scotland for reinforcements, and twice he returned to the bloody work of conquest. It is astonishing how so poor and small a country as Scotland could meet such a prolonged strain on its fighting power as had been involved already in the War of Independence, and yet find a surplus to sacrifice beyond its shores.

After his victory at Arscoll, the Earl of Carrick returned to Ulster. The whole of Ireland, during these years of misery, was afflicted by a direful famine, always the unfailing complement of mediæval warfare. So great was the scarcity that the Irish annalists declare that "men were wont to devour one another."\* For that unhappy land was the theatre of war, not only between English and Scots, and the Irish allies on each side, but independently, between the MacDermotts and the O'Conors, the royal tribe of Connaught; so that the best that can be said for Edward de Brus's enterprise is that he did not inflict any greater suffering on the Irish people than they were in the habit of inflicting on each other. The war was conducted on the same barbarous lines by all the combatants, and the description given in the *Annals of Clonmacnoise* of the Earl of Ulster's operations, apply to each of them in proportion to his strength. The English are described in that chronicle as—

"holding on their course of spoyleing and destroying all places where they came, not spearing Church or Chapel, insomuch that they

\* *Annals of the Four Masters*, vol. iii., p. 521.

did not leave neither field of Corne undestroyed, nor towne unransacked, nor unfrequented place (were it never so desert) unsearched and unburnt, and consumed to meere ashes the very churches that lay in their way into the bear stones."\*

The proceedings of the MacDermott party are painted in even blacker colours—

" They pursued Felym (O'Connor) and Mullrony to Letterlong, and to the borders of the mount of Sliew-Gawe, and also to the valley called Gleanfahrowe, where infinite numbers of Cowes, Gerans, † and sheep were killed by them. They strip'd Gentlemen, ‡ that could make no resistance, of their cloaths to their naked skinns; destroyed and killed without remorse children and little ones of that Journey. There was not seen so much hurt done in those parts before in any man's memory, without profit to the doers of the harm."§

The Earl of Carrick hastened back to the siege of Carrickfergus, and arranged a truce with the garrison till April 13th. But Lord Mandeville, coming to its relief, refused to be bound by this treaty, and a bloody encounter took place in the town, wherein Lord Mandeville was slain on the English side, and Niel Fleming on the Scottish. The garrison agreed to surrender unless relieved before May 31st.

On May 2, 1316, Edward de Brus was crowned King of Ireland.

The day appointed for the capitulation of Carrickfergus having arrived, a party of Scots was sent to take possession. These, however, were treacherously seized and imprisoned, the English commander vowing he meant to defend his castle to the last. In the

\* Mageoghegan's translation.

† Ponies.

‡ Gentlewomen also, according to the Annals of Connaught.

§ *Annals of Clonmacnoise.*

end, some time during the summer, he was compelled to surrender, after the garrison had suffered indescribable hardships through famine.

The chief object of the Earl of Moray's second voyage to Scotland was to convey an earnest entreaty from the new King of Ireland for the personal assistance of the King of Scots, with Edward de Brus's assurance that they would prove irresistible if united in the field. King Robert, therefore, leaving his realm under the guardianship of Douglas and Walter the Steward, sailed from Loch Ryan early in the autumn of 1316, and joined Edward at Carrickfergus. It was probably before this date that the national party in Scotland received a very important accession in the person of Patrick, Earl of March, the same who had given shelter to King Edward in his flight from Bannockburn.\* Of course this greatly lightened the King's anxiety about the security of the East Marches, though Berwick was still held by the English.

King Robert's first encounter on Irish soil was unfortunate. He met the enemy on October 25th,† under Lord Bisset of Antrim and an Irish chief called Cogan or Logan, who defeated him, and took Alan the Steward prisoner. During the winter the King of Scots remained in Ulster: then he and his brother pushed southward through Louth, arriving at Slane on February 16, 1317. Everything connected with this extraordinary expedition is vague

---

\* Bain., iii, 103.

† Barbour says it was in May, but this cannot be reconciled with the dates given by Irish annalists.

and uncertain, except its main outlines, for the Irish annalists are very contradictory, and the minute details given by Barbour are not to be received without reserve. But, under that reserve, two incidents described by the poet will bear repetition.

The English army was encamped on the borders of Leinster, to resist the entrance of the two kings into that province. The King of Scots, who seems to have assumed the chief command, succeeded in outmanœuvring the enemy, and continued to advance upon Dublin. But while the Scots were passing through a wood, their rear division, under the immediate command of King Robert, were attacked by a party of English, who galled them with a destructive discharge of arrows. Edward, in command of the vanguard, continued to advance, unaware of the presence of the enemy. The King of Scots, suspecting that the archers were the advance party of the English army, would not allow any attempt to be made to disperse them, but continued to move forward in "*schiltrome*." Sir Colin Campbell, irritated by the daring of a couple of sharpshooters who pressed nearer than their comrades, turned his horse, galloped after them, and slew one with his spear. But the other bowman let fly a shaft which killed Sir Colin's horse. King Robert then rode up, and dealt Sir Colin such a blow with his truncheon that it felled the knight to the ground.

Disobedience—"the breking of bidding"—might not be overlooked at such a time, for it might have turned to their undoing.\*

---

\* *The Brus*, cxx.

The scene perhaps has been faithfully drawn, and is not likely to have been the bard's invention; but when Barbour proceeds to point the moral, by asserting that when the Scots had cleared the wood, they found 40,000 English drawn up in battle array under Richard de Clare, whom forthwith they attacked and vanquished, he is making an almost incredible statement, of which there is no corroboration elsewhere. Moreover, one is asked to believe that this was accomplished by the single division under the King of Scots. It seems impossible that Edward de Brus, as Barbour affirms, can have led his vanguard so carelessly through an enemy's country, as to have passed 40,000 men without becoming aware of their presence, besides maintaining no communication with the rear division. This is an instance of the disadvantage of having to rely on the poetical labours of an ecclesiastic for an account of military operations.

As the Scottish host approached Dublin, the seat of English rule in Ireland, the spirit of its citizens rose to the occasion. They burned their suburbs and pulled down a church to strengthen their defences; they even went so far as to imprison the Earl of Ulster—the "Red Earl"—because they suspected him, most unjustly, of complicity with his brother-in-law, the King of Scots. Dublin proved too strong to be attacked, though Castle Knock,\* belonging to the Tyrrels, fell into the hands of the Scots.

The invaders remained four days at Leixlip on

\* In what is now the Phoenix Park.

the Liffey, whence they marched to Naas, and so to Cullen, on the borders of Tipperary. Ultimately they penetrated as far as Limerick, wasting and burning all as they went. It is in the neighbourhood of this town that Barbour lays the scene of the other incident above referred to. The troops had fallen in, ready to start on their homeward march, and were awaiting the King's command to move, when the wail of a woman in pain was heard. King Robert asked what it meant, and was informed that it was an Irish washerwoman among the campfollowers, who had been seized with the pains of childbirth, and whom it would be necessary to leave behind. Touched with pity, the King caused the whole army to remain still, while a tent was unpacked and pitched for the poor woman's reception; "for," said he,

" Certis I trow thar is na man  
That he will rew ne \* a woman than.  
This was ane full gret curtasy,  
That sic ane king and sa mighty  
Gert his men duell † on this maner  
Bot for ane full pouer lavender." ‡

Well may one pause at this point to ask if this is the same Robert, King of Scots, who showed himself so wary and so much averse to unnecessary bloodshed in the winning of his own realm. For what goal can he be straining in roaming so far from his proper sphere? what strategy is he pursuing, in

\* Who will not pity.

† Made his men wait.

‡ For a poor washerwoman.

allowing an enemy so powerful to occupy all the ground between him and his base of operations? Above all—if, as cannot be doubted, he loved his own people who had suffered so sorely in his cause—if he had any concern for the future of the kingdom it had cost so much to win—how could he suffer himself to be severed for so long from all communication with Scotland, and from all intelligence of how things were faring at home? To answer these questions, one is reduced to almost sheer conjecture. Perhaps it was the bare necessity of subsistence that had led the invading army further and further in search of supplies with the illusory prospect of winning the support of native tribes in the south and west. Some picture is traced in the sorrowful annals of these times of the straits to which the Scots were reduced in that famine-stricken land. Many of them were starved to death, and the survivors were reduced to living on the flesh of their horses.\* The Irish annalists mention with horror that the natives who marched with the Scots did not scruple to eat meat in Lent, and were punished next year for that deadly offence by being reduced, first to eat human flesh, and then to die of starvation.

If the Kings of Scotland and Ireland had been led so far afield in the expectation of a general rising in their favour under the native chiefs, the illusion was very completely dispelled. To the Irish Celts the de Brus seemed as much Norman as de Burgh or de Bermingham—more so in fact, for the de Burghs at least had acquired by marriage a

---

\* Fordun, cxxxii.



standing among the royal O'Conors of Connaught. All that Robert and Edward de Brus had any reason to expect, and all that they received from the moment they left Ulster, was temporary and precarious alliance with those septs who saw in them instruments whereby to carry on their private feuds.

In the month of March the English were in force at Kilkenny under Edmund Butler and Richard de Clare. Lord Hailes and others have commented on their inactivity, and blamed them for want of vigilance in allowing the Scots to escape from their wretched plight with impunity. But in truth the difficulties that pressed so hardly on the invaders lay with even greater weight on the defenders. The English had a far larger army to feed than the Scots, though the figure of 30,000 given in the Irish annals is probably far beyond their actual strength; doubtless scarcity of supplies was the chief cause of their allowing the dilapidated remains of Bruce's army to retrace their steps almost without resistance. Another and subsidiary reason was that Roger Mortimer was on his way back to Ireland as Viceroy, and the opening of the summer campaign was postponed till his arrival. He landed on April 7, 1317, but by that time the Scots were far on their way to Ulster.

In May the King of Scots returned to his own dominions, to find that Douglas and Walter the Steward had faithfully discharged their duty as guardians.



Thomas, Earl of Lancaster.



Sir Richard Fitz Alan,  
Earl of Arundel.

## CHAPTER XI.

### CONTINUED SUCCESS OF THE SCOTTISH ARMS.

A.D. 1316-1319.

IT is a relief to turn from the dismal record of the Irish campaign and resume the course of events in Scotland. There, too, there had been suffering and anxiety, and the pages are plentifully sprinkled with blood; but it is at least a more inspiring story than the ignoble slaughter of starving and half-naked kernes in a quarrel between English and Scots, for a dominion which both were striving to usurp.

There had been stirring times in King Robert's absence, and his taste for knight-errantry must have caused him some twinges of envy as he listened to the report which Douglas had to lay before him.

Not a solitary gleam of good fortune had shone on the English arms since, in the spring of 1315, John of Lorn had recaptured the Isle of Man,\* which Bruce had conquered in June, 1313.† Aymer

\* Bain, iii., 80.

† Barbour is wholly at fault in his account of the capture of this chieftain during King Robert's expedition to the Western Isles.

de Valence, having failed in administering the ward-enry of the northern counties, had been superseded, in part at least, by the appointment of Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, on August 8, 1315.\* A great muster of English troops had been ordered by Lancaster to take place at Newcastle on June 24, 1316, but this had been postponed by royal warrant till September 10th, thus enabling the Scots to raid Richmond and Furness, as described in a former chapter. Circumstances interfered with the September muster also, and once more action was deferred till October. By that time the King of Scots had sailed for Ireland, and Richard de Kellow, the gallant Bishop of Durham, was dead. His successor was a Frenchman, Ludovic de Belmont, whom the Pope, as it was said, appointed to the see on condition that he should defend the Marches against the Scots. The chronicler of Lanercost, professionally summing up the new bishop's qualifications, describes him as "well-born, but lame on both legs, hospitable notwithstanding, and of a merry disposition."

The English army assembled according to orders at Newcastle after Michaelmas, but King Edward failed to appear to take command. Men said he could not brook any intercourse with the Earl of Lancaster, so the troops were disbanded. The Earl of Arundel, however, being advised by spies that it was a propitious time for a raid on the Marches, en-

There is ample documentary proof that Lorn was Edward II.'s admiral on the west coast, and continued to serve as such till he returned to London in 1317, worn out and about to die, leaving his kinsman, Sir Dougall Macdouall of Galloway, his executor.—Bain, iii., 80.

\* *Rotuli Scotiæ*, i., 149.

tered Scotland near Jedburgh. It will be remembered that Roxburgh Castle had been dismantled after its capture from the English in February, 1314; but probably it was in their possession again at this time, for there is documentary evidence to show that they had reoccupied it before the spring of 1317. Arundel's purpose, according to Barbour, was to level Jedworth Forest, because it gave convenient harbour to the Scots when preparing to raid Northumberland, and to that end his men were armed with felling axes.\* Douglas was employing his leisure in building himself a house at Lintalee, on the banks of the Jed, having with him about fifty men-at-arms and a company of bowmen. Hearing of Arundel's approach, he prepared an ambushade at a place where the Jed flows through a narrow glen-wooded gorge. He made the passage more difficult by bending down the tops of young birch-trees and weaving them together across the paths. The English entered the defile without suspicion, and suddenly the banks echoed to the dreaded war-cry: "Douglas! Douglas!" The archers opened a heavy fire on the flanks, while Douglas charged the column from the rear. The English commander could neither deploy nor form square, owing to the narrowness of the ground; his men fell into confusion, and were routed with heavy loss, Sir Thomas de Richmond himself being slain by Douglas.†

\* Barbour puts Arundel's strength at the improbable figure of 10,000, besides erroneously giving the command of the whole to Thomas de Richmond without mentioning Arundel.

† Not, as Hailes follows Barbour in believing, one of the house of Brittany, but a Yorkshire knight, owner of Burton-Constable. He

Meanwhile, another band of English, finding the new house of Lintalee defenceless, had taken possession of it, and were making free with such good cheer as they could lay their hands on; until Douglas, returning from the affair in the glen, surprised them carousing, and put most of them to the sword.


Still more to the liking of the King of Scots must have been the next feat of arms by the Black Douglas, when he encountered Sir Robert de Neville, the "Peacock of the North," near Berwick. Neville, weary of perpetually listening to the renown of Douglas, had pledged his knightly word to assail him whensoever he should see his banner displayed; and Douglas, having been told of this vaunt, was not slow to take up the challenge. He marched all night to Berwick, where Neville was stationed, and displayed his banner—the well-known azure field with three silver stars.\*

To ensure Neville's attention he fired some of the neighbouring villages. The Peacock showed no delay in response, but marched out of the town at once with a party of picked men-at-arms, and took up a position on a hill. Douglas challenged him to single combat; Neville accepted, of course, but few men

---

was at the siege of Caerlaverock in 1300, constable of Norham in 1310, and warden of Cockermouth in 1314.

\* The old arms of Douglas were: *Azure*, three stars or mullets, *argent*. After King Robert's death, the stars were placed on an azure chief, while below, on a field *argent*, was shown a human heart, *gules*. It was not till long afterwards that the heart was surmounted by an imperial crown, as borne at the present time—William, 11th Earl of Angus and 1st Marquis of Douglas (1611-1660) having been the first to assume that addition.



could engage with Douglas on equal terms, and the English knight paid for his daring with his life. The English, disheartened by the loss of their gallant leader, broke and fled. The usual slaughter followed, and Neville's three brothers, Sir Alexander, Ralph and John, were among the prisoners taken. They were held to ransom for 2000 marks each.\*

About the time that these events were taking place on the Border, the English landed in force near Inverkeithing, in Fife. The Earl of Fife and King Robert's sheriff, after vainly attempting to prevent them landing, retired before superior numbers, their retreat, according to Barbour's showing, being of the nature of *sauve-qui-peut*. In the nick of time came on the scene a stout prelate, William Sinclair, Bishop of Dunkeld, with a troop of sixty horse—

“Himself was armit jolely  
And rad apon ane stalward sted.”

He asked the earl why he and his men were riding so fast, and, on the reason being explained to him, rounded on him in a tone which none but an ecclesiastic would have dared to use towards a powerful baron. He charged him flatly with cowardice, and declared that, if the Earl got his deserts, the King should order the gilt spurs to be hewn off his craven heels. Then, throwing off his priestly cloak, the Bishop appeared in full armour, and called on the

\* None of the chroniclers, so far as I know, mention the capture of Neville's brothers, but it is attested by their petition for ransom. Ralph begged King Edward to give him some rich ward or marriage, which he might sell in order to raise funds.—Bain, iii., 101.

fugitives for very shame to follow him. The men only wanted a leader: they rallied at once under the dauntless prelate. The English had turned to foraying, and were scattered far and wide, except one detachment which was still in good array. This the Scots' cavalry dispersed by a furious charge, driving the men to their boats; the rest were slaughtered in detail, and thus the "kynrik" of Fife was saved. When the King of Scots heard of this, he declared that Sinclair should be *his* bishop; who accordingly, until his death and long after, went by the name of "the King's bishop."

One more exploit claims mention before King Robert reappears on the scene. It has been told how bravely Sir Andrew de Harcla defended Carlisle against the Scots, and how he received King Edward's guerdon for the capture of John de Moray. Harcla himself was taken prisoner now, riding with 300 men "horsit jolely," by Sir John de Soulis of Eskdale with but fifty. So much Barbour tells us, but refrains from giving the particulars, for, says he,

" I will nocht rehers the maner,  
For quha sa likis, tha may her  
Yhoung wemen, quhen the will play,  
Syng it amang tham ilke day." \*

Would that the archdeacon had preserved for us this ballad! The main fact is confirmed by a letter from de Harcla to King Edward, begging that he

---

\* " I will not rehearse the manner,  
For whoso likes may hear  
Young women, when they are at play  
Sing it among them every day."

may have John de Moray and Robert Bard (olph), whom he took at Carlisle, in aid of his own ransom. He adds that his valet,\* John de Beauchamp, will explain to the King how he had fallen into the hands of the Scots; and thus the lover of Border chivalry is baulked again of information about this episode.

The first business claiming the attention of the King of Scots on his return from Ireland was very different to any that he had been engaged in for a long time. King Edward, having been beaten all along the line in military operations, now sought to enlist on his side the influence of spiritual powers. He had appealed to Pope John XXII., who, at Edward's instance, issued a bull, commanding a truce for two years between England and Scotland, under pain of excommunication. Two cardinals, Guacelin, of SS. Marcellinus and Peter, and Luke, of S. Maria in the Via Lata, were sent with plenary powers to enforce this decree, and to excommunicate Robert de Brus, "self-styled King of Scotland," and any others who, in their opinion, deserved it. They also had power to absolve Robert's subjects from their oath of fealty.

Lord Hailes was of opinion that the letter of the cardinals to the Pope, giving an account of the negotiations which ensued, as preserved in Rymer's *Fœdera*, contained the most authentic description of the Bruce's presence which had come down to modern times. That writer has given a summary of this letter in language so vivid, and

---

\* The term "valet" did not mean a domestic servant, but a gentleman-attendant.



representing the original so closely, that quotation is at once fairer to him, and probably more effective, than any fresh attempt at paraphrase.

The messengers (*precursores*) sent by the cardinals were the Bishop of Corbau and the Archdeacon of Perpignan.\* They waited on the King of Scots about the beginning of September, 1317.

"The King," says Lord Hailes, "graciously received them and heard them with patient attention. After having consulted with his barons, he made answer, that he mightily desired to procure a good and perpetual peace, either by the mediation of the Cardinals, or by any other means. He allowed the *open* letters from the Pope, which recommended peace, to be read in his presence, and he listened to them with all due respect; but he would not receive the *sealed* letters addressed to 'Robert Bruce governing in Scotland.' 'Among my barons,' said he, 'there are many of the name of Robert Bruce, who share in the government of Scotland; these letters may possibly be addressed to some one of them; but they are not addressed to me, who am King of Scotland. I can receive no letters which are not addressed to me under that title, unless with the advice and approbation of my parliament. I will forthwith assemble my parliament, and with their advice return my answer.'

"The messengers attempted to apologise for omission of the title of King; they said that Holy Church was not wont, during the dependence of a controversy, to write or say anything which might be interpreted as prejudicial to the claims of either of the contending parties. 'Since, then,' answered the King, 'my spiritual father and my holy mother would not prejudice the cause of my adversary by bestowing on me the appellation of King during the dependence of the controversy, they ought not to have prejudiced my cause by withdrawing that appellation from me. I am in possession of the kingdom of Scotland; all my people call me King, and foreign Princes address me under that title; but it seems that my parents are partial to their English son. Had you presumed to present letters with such an address to any other sovereign Prince

---

\* *Papal Letters*, ii., 429.

you might, perhaps, have been answered in a harsher style; but I reverence you as messengers of the holy see.' He delivered this sarcastical and resolute answer with a mild and pleasant countenance.\*

"The messengers next requested the King to command a temporary cessation of hostilities. 'To that,' replied the King, 'I can never consent without the approbation of my Parliament, especially while the English daily invade and spoil my people.'

"The King's counsellors told the messengers that if the letters had been addressed to the King of Scots, the negotiations for peace would have instantly commenced. They imputed the slighting omission of the title of King to the intrigues of the English at the Papal court, and they unguardedly hinted that they had this intelligence from Avignon.

"'While the title of King is withheld,' said the messengers to their constituents, 'there can be no hopes of a treaty.'

"On receiving this intelligence, the Cardinals resolved to proclaim the papal truce in Scotland. In this hazardous office they employed Adam Newton, guardian of the monastery of Minorites at Berwick. He was charged with letters to the Scottish clergy, and particularly to the Bishop of St. Andrews. He found the King of Scots with his army in a wood near Old Cambus, making preparations for the assault of Berwick. Although personal access to the King was denied, the obedient monk proclaimed the truce by authority of the Pope. When the King of Scots was informed that the papal instruments still denied him his titles, he returned them saying, 'I will listen to no bulls, until I am treated as King of Scotland and have made myself master of Berwick.'

"The monk, terrified at this answer, requested either a safe-conduct to Berwick, or permission to pass into Scotland, and deliver letters to some of the Scottish clergy. But both his requests were denied, and he was commanded forthwith to leave the country. In his return to Berwick he was waylaid, stripped, and robbed of all his parchments, together with his letters and instructions. The robbers, it is said, tore the Pope's Bull." †

\* *Laeta facie et amicabili vultu, semper ad patrem et matrem reverentiam ostendendo.*—*Fœdera*, iii., 662.

† Hailes, ii., 93. That the Pope's letters were torn up is confirmed by his subsequent letter to the Cardinals—(*Papal Letters*, ii., 429).

The opening of the Vatican Records by Pope Leo XIII. to the students of all nations has put it in the power of modern readers to corroborate the accuracy of Hailes's interpretation of the materials at his disposal, and also to add some particulars not in his possession. For instance, copies have been preserved in that repository of Pope John's reiterated exhortations to King Robert that he should hasten to make peace with Edward, so that he (Robert) might be free to undertake another crusade. Then the disputed right of Robert de Brus to the title of King of Scots leads to a lengthy correspondence. First Pope John scolds the Cardinals for not informing him clearly whether King Edward has consented to his addressing Robert as King. As the Pope observes that Robert has assumed the title, he is afraid its omission may hinder the negotiations for peace, therefore he begs King Edward not to be offended if he uses it in his correspondence with Robert. Next, the Pope writes to Robert, explaining why he had omitted the title in former letters, begging him not to take it amiss, for that, in truth, it did not affect the validity of his claim one way or another. Finally he dispatches a letter to Edward, telling him that inasmuch as Robert positively refuses to receive any letters except those addressed to him as King of Scots, he has adopted that style in writing to him and again begs that he will not take it amiss.\*

King Edward, though very ill prepared for war,

\* *Papal Letters*, vol. ii., *passim*.

owing to his quarrel with Lancaster and other difficulties, was not ready to yield the point about King Robert's title. On October 6th he issued a proclamation, strictly forbidding all jousts, tournaments, and knight-errantry, in order that all energies should be concentrated on the Scottish war. The King of Scots, on his part, pushed forward preparations for the siege of Berwick. The mayor and burgesses of that town had undertaken to defend it for a year from June 15, 1317, receiving for that purpose the sum of 6000 marks from the English exchequer, and giving hostages for the faithful performance of the work.\* But Sir Roger de Horsley was governor of the castle, a knight who hated all Scotsmen, whether loyal to King Edward or not; and the rough way in which he showed his feelings soon brought about mischief between him and the townsfolk.† A certain burgess of Berwick, Simon of Spalding by name, resenting de Horsley's rudeness, wrote privily to the Earl of March offering, on a given night when he, Simon, should be on guard, to admit an escalading party over the wall. March showed the letter in confidence to King Robert, who thanked him for doing so, observing that, if the earl had gone either to Douglas or to Moray he would have roused the jealousy of the other. There is a hint here of that risk which always beset military undertakings on a

---

\* Bain, iii., 107.

† In making this allegation, Barbour is amply confirmed by a commission granted by King Edward (February 4, 1318), to enquire into the disputes between the burgesses and the garrison—(Bain, iii., 112).

feudal basis, before professional seniority was established as the measure of responsibility. Douglas and Moray both served King Robert nobly and well, but it was perhaps owing to the King's tact in adjusting the orbits of two such stars in one small firmament that they never came into collision.

The King directed March to conceal his men at Duns, where Douglas and Moray were sent to meet him. From Duns they marched together to Berwick, duly provided with scaling-ladders, climbed the wall with Spalding's assistance, and obtained easy possession of the town, though the castle remained in the hands of the garrison. A party of Scots was told off for purposes of plunder, the rest being kept under arms with their officers. But this proved too great a trial for the discipline of these wild soldiers. They broke away, and soon almost the whole force was scattered through the streets collecting booty.

Their disobedience nearly brought about their ruin. At daylight (it was on March 28, 1318) the governor of the castle, perceiving the state of affairs, how Douglas and Moray had been left with a mere handful of men, ordered an immediate sortie. The Scottish chiefs were only saved from capture, and their troops from slaughter in detail, by the activity and presence of mind shown by a young knight, Sir William de Keith of Galston, who rode through the town recalling the soldiers to their standards. He succeeded in bringing them to a sense of their position; the English were driven back; but the castle continued to hold out for no less than sixteen weeks,

when the garrison was compelled to surrender through famine.\* Sir Roger, who made such a gallant defence, lost an eye.

One of the garrison of Berwick Castle, Robert de Blackburn, who had lost his brother and "all his friends" at Bannockburn, deserves mention for a brave deed performed during the siege. He swam the Tweed on horseback with letters to King Edward, and leading a string of twenty-one horses, all of which he avers in his petition to the King that he took safely to Newcastle.†

The King of England was furious at the loss of the town of Berwick, accusing the burgesses of treachery. While the castle was still holding out, he ordered such property in England as belonged to the towns people to be confiscated,‡ and imprisoned those unlucky citizens who escaped from the town to take refuge in England.§

During the siege of Berwick Castle a Scottish army invaded Northumberland as far as Newcastle. Wark and Harbottle were surrendered to them on the failure of relief appearing at the stipulated times ;

\* Barbour says the castle held out only six days after the town had been taken, and Hailes, commenting on the statement in *Scalacronica* that it resisted for eleven weeks, remarks that the invasion of England in May by the Scots renders this "altogether incredible." Nevertheless, de Horsley's acknowledgment of sustenance received for his garrison *after he had surrendered* runs from July 20th to August 24th, which, taken in connection with other documents, seems conclusive (Bain, iii., 113, 115).

† Bain, iii., 118. The endorsement of this petition is not of the best augury for its fulfilment: "the King will speak with the treasurer."

‡ *Ibid.*, 113.

§ *Ibid.*, 114.

Mitford was taken by stratagem.\* A still more destructive raid was made in May, in which Yorkshire suffered most; Northallerton, Boroughbridge, Knaresborough, and Skipton being burnt, and the town of Ripon escaping on the payment of 1000 marks. The tower of Knaresborough church retains to this day the marks of flames, kindled, it is supposed, to burn out the people who had taken refuge there.†

William de Melton, the new Archbishop of York, bestirred himself too late to resist this *infanda invasio Scotorum*, as he termed it. It was not till June 4th, after the mischief had been wrought, that he summoned the Abbot and Convent of St. Mary's, York, to array their tenants and servants, and bring them to the army then assembling in the archiepiscopal city.‡ The Scots got home safe, carrying with them many prisoners and a vast number of cattle, and caring little, it may be supposed, for the anathema of excommunication, wholesale and individual—*omnes et singulos*—which the infuriated Primate hurled after them.§

The good people of Hartlepool fell into great trepidation at this time, because King Robert, in selling a truce to the bishopric of Durham, had expressly excepted their town, which he vowed he meant to burn in reprisal for the taking of a ship laden with his "armeours" and victual. They sent in hot haste to King Edward, begging his help to build a city wall. He forwarded the somewhat meagre subscrip-

\* *Lanercost*, 235.

† Raine, Introduction, xxvii.

‡ Raine, 275.

§ *Ibid.*, 277.

tion of 100 marks (about £60) and told them to hurry on the works.\*

By this time the two Cardinals had reported to the Pope the failure of their mission and the refusal of Robert de Brus to receive the papal letters, unless addressed to him as King of Scots. The Pope declared such a result completely dazed him—*nec sine stupore miramur*. Being very impatient for the undertaking of a new crusade, he commanded the prayers of all the faithful to be made to Him “to whom nothing is impossible,” for the restoration of peace; and, inasmuch as curses, even on the most magnificent scale, cost no more than the price of a sheet of parchment and a wax candle, the Cardinals were directed to excommunicate Robert de Brus and all his abettors.

The English army assembled at York early in June, 1318, in order to recapture the town of Berwick; but the troops had no sooner come together than they had to be disbanded, because of the disagreements and mutual distrust of their commanders.†

On October 5, 1318, Edward de Brus, titular King of Ireland, died on the fatal field of Dundalk.‡ This

\* Bain, iii., 114.

† Suborto tumultu pariter et simultate cum aliis impedimentis.—Walsingham.

‡ Barbour relates a curious story about Edward de Brus's death. He says that Edward exchanged armour that morning with one Gib Harper; that Gib was slain and that the conquerors cut off his head, believing it to be the King of Ireland's, and sent it to King Edward. It should be remembered that a knight, in exchanging armour with one of inferior degree, incurred the greater risk of death; for the



event not only put an end to the interference of the Scots in Irish affairs, but it reopened the far more pressing question of the succession to the throne of Scotland. Parliament was called together at Scone in December, 1318, and the inheritance was settled on Robert, the only son of Walter the Stewart and the deceased Princess Marjorie, always saving any male issue which the King might have subsequently. The Earl of Moray again was designated guardian in the event of a minority; and, failing him, Douglas. But such guardianship was to cease, on its appearing to the community, or to *the greater or wiser part thereof*,\* that the young King was capable of assuming the government.

Some of the other Acts passed by this Parliament proved of lasting effect on the judicial code of Scotland; but those which were chiefly directed at the circumstances of the time were those establishing the liberties of the Church of Scotland (including, of course, benefit of clergy); prescribing armour and weapons to be provided by all men according to their condition;† forbidding all trade with England

prospect of ransom made it ever more desirable to capture, than to kill, eminent persons. Among other Scottish notables slain on this day were Sir John de Soulis, John, brother of Walter the Stewart, and Sir Philip de Moubray, the defender of Stirling. John de Bermingham, the English general, was created Earl of Louth, and was granted £20 a year for his services.

\* Quoniam communitati regni, vel majori et saniori parti visum. Hailes explains this suggestive phrase as being merely a periphrasis for the majority, on the ground that any other interpretation would be impracticable.

† Every lay landowner worth ten pounds in goods was bound, under penalty of forfeiture, to have an acton (leather jacket), a bassi-

on pain of death; restraining the clergy from sending money to the Pope for the purchase of Bulls, and constituting as an offence "lease-making," or the invention of rumours calculated to disturb the relations between the sovereign and his people. It is amusing to find that, even at such a critical time, Parliament was as ready in the 14th century to legislate about salmon fishing as it remains in the 19th.

The inefficiency which crippled the military projects of England, was not apparent in her continental diplomacy. The trade between Scotland and the Low Countries had endured since the days of William the Lion and probably from earlier times.\* Wool, fish, hides, and a few other native commodities, were exported in exchange for wine, arms, cloth, and other goods. It was now the policy of the English Government to persuade the Count of Flanders to close his ports to Scotsmen. The Count's reply was firm and statesmanlike. He said that his country was open to all men, and he declined to injure his own people by excluding any merchants who had been in the custom of trading there. A similar answer was returned by the town council of Bruges.†

King Edward was busy also at this time intriguing, under the Pope's sanction, with certain barons

---

net (helmet), a plate glove, sword, and spear, or, failing these, a good habergeon (mail shirt), an iron cuirass, with an iron helmet and plate gloves. Every man owning the value of a cow in goods to have a bow and 24 arrows, or a spear.

\* About 1182, Philip, Count of Flanders, granted a charter to the monk of Melrose, exempting their traders from any toll or duty on land or sea.

† Bain, iii., 130.


and others of influence in the Scottish King's service, who he had reason to expect were inclined to revert to their former allegiance to himself.\* In this may be traced the source of the formidable conspiracy against King Robert to be disclosed in the following year. The Pope co-operated with Edward by writing a letter on April 25th to the English bishops, empowering them to release from excommunication all Scotsmen who should return to their allegiance to the King of England. †

---

\* Hailes, ii., 109, note.

† Raine, 286.





Sir Walter the Steward.



Sir Thomas Gray of Hetoun.

## CHAPTER XII.

### INVASION AND COUNTER-INVASION.

A.D. 1319-1322.

NORHAM Castle, a border fortress of great strength and importance on the south bank of the Tweed, was held for the English during eleven stormy years by Sir Thomas Gray of Heton. The son of that knight tells us, in his *Scalacronica*, that it would be tedious to recount all the exploits and hardships of which it was the scene. The stories he does permit himself to tell are of a sort that make one regret his reticence. Here is one of them.

Sir William Marmion, a knight of Lincolnshire, was feasting with some other knights and ladies, when there was brought to him from his lady-love a gilt helmet and crest, together with her commands that he should take her gift to the most perilous place in Britain, and there make it famous. It was decided by the company present, to whom Marmion referred the question, that there was no place like

Norham for feats of chivalry; and thither, accordingly, Sir William took his way. He had not long to wait for adventure, for just as he was sitting down to dinner at noon, on the fourth day after his arrival, appeared Sir Alexander de Moubray\* with some other knights and 160 men-at-arms. Sir Thomas Gray had already formed up his garrison, for defence, when he noticed Marmion on foot, shining with gold and silver—*tout relusaunt dor et dargent*—and wearing his gold helmet.

“Sir knight,” said Sir Thomas, “you have come hither a knight errant to make famous your helmet. It is more fitting that chivalry be done on horseback than on foot, where that is possible; therefore mount your charger. See! there is the enemy; set spurs to your horse and charge among them. I renounce God if I do not rescue you dead or alive, or perish in the attempt.”

Marmion did not blanch. He mounted a splendid war-horse—*un bel destreir*—and charged alone against the Scots. Wounded, he was thrown to the ground and was at the point of being slain, when Gray, charging on foot with all his men, rescued the knight as he had pledged himself to do. Then the ladies in the castle led their horses out to Sir Thomas and his men, who mounted and rode in pursuit of the flying Scots, killing many of them and taking fifty valuable horses—*cheualx de pris*. It is to be hoped that Marmion earned his lady's favour, in spite

---

\* Brother of Sir Philip, killed at Dundalk. Afterwards he went over to the English side, on the conviction of Roger de Moubray of high treason, in August, 1320, and received King Edward's pardon. —Bain, iii., 136, 435.

of the injuries he received. It is recorded that the Scots "made shipwreck of his features"—*ly naufrerent hu visage*.

In the spring of 1319, King Edward, having composed for the time his quarrel with the Earl of Lancaster,\* resumed preparations for the recapture of Berwick. He issued orders for the muster of a powerful army at Newcastle on July 24th. The pay-sheets, preserved in the Tower, furnish exact information of the strength of the land forces, amounting to 120 cross-bowmen, 1520 archers, 3000 English foot and 2400 Welsh, and 1040 hobelars (light horse); in all, 8080 men.† Besides these, there must be reckoned the King's bodyguard, as well as the numerous knights and their personal retinues, bringing the total to at least 12,000 of all ranks. The unlucky Earl of Pembroke was there; also Umfraville, Earl of Angus, and such well-known captains as Sir Anthony de Lucy, Sir Andrew de Harcla (who had regained his liberty), and Sir Hugh de Lowther. Of the numbers on board the fleet no record has been preserved. To help King Edward to defray the expense of this expedition, the Pope authorised the Archbishop of York to advance to him £2505 14s. 1d. out of the funds collected for the crusade ‡—significant evidence of the eagerness of his Holiness for the success of the English arms.

\* Raine, 290.

† Bain, iii., 125. The pay from August 1st to September 24th amounted to £3048 3s. The Earl of Lancaster had been summoned with 2000 men, but his name does not appear on the pay-sheet. Barbour, however, says he was present at the siege.

‡ Raine, 310.

King Robert had committed the custody of war-worn Berwick into the capable hands of Walter the Steward, who had diligently strengthened the defences, and provisioned the castle against all emergency. The English army invested the town, forming entrenchments round their own lines, and filling the harbour with their ships. On September 7th a general assault took place. The city walls, in spite of the great strategic value of this place, were so low, says Barbour, that a spearman on the top could strike an assailant outside in the face with his weapon. The garrison, therefore, had a busy time throwing down the scaling-ladders of the enemy. In the afternoon a vessel was towed up the river on the flood tide, as far as the bridge-house, and an attempt was made to make her fast to the wall. She carried a fall-bridge, whereby it was intended to enter the town. But she was kept at bay till, with the falling tide, she took the ground, when the garrison made a sortie and set her on fire. The fighting went on all day, until towards evening the English were recalled to their lines, and nothing further was attempted for five days.

The Scots in Berwick found a most valuable assistant in the person of one John Crab, a Flemish engineer. Barbour says that he was one of the prisoners taken in the English ship burnt at the bridge, but this is disproved by a correspondence which took place earlier in the same year between King Edward and the Count of Flanders, of which Crab was the subject. He had, it seems, committed some acts of piracy on English shipping, and the Count assured Edward that if he could catch the

fellow, he would break him on the wheel.\* To the Scots, however, he proved the means of saving Berwick. The English employed themselves in constructing a huge engine called the Sow, moving, like a modern fire-escape, on wheels, and devised to land a storming party on the top of the walls and at the same time as it conveyed a mining party to the bottom. To match this, Crab made a crane—a kind of catapult—also on wheels, by means of which not only heavy stones but burning faggots could be discharged on the Sow.

At dawn on September 13th the English trumpets sounded the advance; the mighty Sow crawled forward to the walls, the protecting crane rolled along the ramparts to meet it, while storming parties clambered the defences at different points.

It was a moment of critical anxiety.

Crab was warned that if he failed to disable the Sow he should be put to death instantly. Thus set on his mettle, the crafty Fleming caused a large stone to be put in his engine. Taking a careful aim, he touched the trigger, releasing the missile, which flew hurtling over the Sow, and fell harmlessly behind it.† The enemy inside the monster loudly

\* Bain, iii., 126. This must be the same individual mentioned in *Scalacronica* as having been taken and killed by the elder Gray between Norham and Berwick. “Thomas de Gray fist tuer en le Yarforde, Cryn, vn Flemmyng, vn amirail de la mere, vn robbour, qi grant meistre estoit od Robert de Bruys.”

† “In hy he gert draw the cleket  
And smertly swappit out the stane,  
That even out our the Sow is gane,  
And behind hir ane lital we  
It fell.”



cheered. The Sow continued to approach. Crab's next shot fell short, and the Sow was touching the wall before a third could be made ready. This time the engineer took better aim. The great stone crashed into the frame-work of the machine; the inmates tumbled out in confusion. It was the turn of the Scots to cheer now. "Your Sow has farrowed!" they cried, and Crab piled blazing material on the disabled engine, whereby it was soon reduced to ashes.

No sooner had that danger been disposed of than need arose for Crab's crane at another part of the defences. An English ship, with her fortified tops full of men, drew close under the wall; but a well directed shot from the crane brought down her top hamper, and with it all the sharp-shooters posted therein.

All this time Sir Walter the Steward was riding about from point to point, superintending the defence. Of his bodyguard, originally one hundred strong, only one man-at-arms remained with him: the rest had been detached for service on the ramparts as occasion arose. Word was brought to Sir Walter that the English had forced a barricade outside the Mary Gate, and were about to fire the gate itself. He called out the reserve from the castle, where there had been no fighting, and drew them up behind the threatened gate. Then, causing the gate to be thrown open suddenly, he and his men dashed through the fire and fell upon the English with such fury that they gave way. Night came at last, to put an end to a long day of hard fighting, the Scots having made good their defence.

Notwithstanding the successful repulse of the enemy, the Steward must have been forced in the end to yield through famine, for the King of Scots was not strong enough to attack the English trenches and relieve the beleaguered town. But Robert was not going to leave his brave son-in-law to his fate. He had already taken measures to create a diversion by invading England. Douglas and Moray crossed the west Marshes, with the design, as Walsingham says, of taking prisoner the Queen of England, then living in York, and holding her as a hostage for the safety of Berwick. In this they did not succeed, but they overran Yorkshire, even as far as the suburbs of York itself.

Warlike Archbishop Melton did his best. He collected all the forces the neighbourhood could furnish, ecclesiastics as well as laymen, and met the Scots at Myton-on-Swale, on September 20th. The result was as might have been expected: the trained veterans of Douglas and Moray put the motley crowd to flight at the first onset. The Archbishop's levies made such a poor show of resistance that men, in derision, called that affair the Chapter of Myton. So heavy were the Archbishop's losses, that he had to issue a plaintive appeal to thirty-one abbeys and priories in the north for pecuniary help. His servants stupidly had taken his plate to Myton with the troops, where it fell into the hands of the Scots, together with all his carriages and other movables.\*

But the most important result of this spirited foray

---

\* Raine, 295.

was its effect on the besiegers of Berwick. The strategy of the King of Scots was justified by its complete success. King Edward could not allow a victorious army to career at will through his dominions. Whether there be truth or not in the allegations of fresh dissensions between Lancaster and le Despenser, the fact that the siege of Berwick was raised on or before September 24th is established by the pay-roll of the army, above referred to, coming to an end on that day, when the bulk of the forces were paid off.

It was now more than thirteen years since Robert de Brus, an excommunicated assassin and proclaimed rebel, had been crowned King of Scots, and then had to fly from the pursuit of the whole armed force of both kingdoms. Now, the whole of Scotland owned him as King; he possessed every inch of its soil; his so-called Overlord had been driven twice across the Border, after bringing all the power at his command, military, diplomatic, and spiritual, to bear on the subjugation of the smaller and weaker country. Beaten, disheartened and distracted by the feuds of his barons, Edward seemed finally brought to his knees, and sent commissioners to treat for peace. The embassy consisted of the Bishop of Ely, the Earl of Pembroke (it must have been a bitter duty for him to discharge!), Hugh le Despenser the younger, and Bartholemew de Badlesmere.\* To confer with these King Robert appointed five plenipotentiaries—no bishop, perhaps because he was lying under the ban of the Church—Sir William de Soulis, Sir Robert de

---

\* Bain, iii., 129.

Keith, Sir Roger de Kirkpatrick, Sir Alexander de Seton, and Sir William de Montfichet.\* Terms of truce were agreed to between the commissioners on December 21, 1319, and ratified by King Robert at Berwick on the following day.† It was to endure for two years from St. Thomas's Day, King Robert undertaking on his part, to erect no new fortresses within the shires of Berwick, Roxburgh, and Dumfries; while King Edward consented to deliver Harbottle Castle to the Scots, or else to destroy it.‡

Meanwhile the Pope continued to act vigorously in Edward's interest, probably not having foreseen the speedy collapse of the latest invasion of Scotland. In October, 1319, he issued fresh instructions for the excommunication of the much-execrated King of Scots, unmindful, apparently, of the fact that the more curses had been heaped on the Bruce, the more constantly fortune had smiled on his arms. This new sentence was not put into immediate execution, for, on January 8, 1320, the Pope summoned "the noble man Robert de Brus, governing the Kingdom of Scotland," § to appear, with the prelates of Scotland, at his court at Avignon.

To this summons King Robert paid no attention, because, although it was accompanied by a safe conduct, it was not addressed to him as King. Therefore the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of

\* The name Montfichet has assumed the homely disguise of Mushat in modern Scots.

† Bain, iii., 129.

‡ *Ibid.*, 131. It was dismantled.

§ Nobilem virum, Robertum de Brus, regnum Scotiæ gubernantem.

London and Carlisle received the papal mandate to publish the sentence of excommunication without further delay, coupled with the injunction that Bruce was on no account to be released from it, until he should be at the point of death.\* A few months later, on July 20, 1320, the Bishops of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, and Moray were also excommunicated for contumacy, forasmuch as they, too, had neglected the Pope's summons to Avignon. But in the meantime the Pope had received his answer from the Scottish nation. The laymen in Parliament at Arbroath had drawn up and forwarded their celebrated letter to John XXII.

The preamble of this document recites the mythical origin of the Scots from Scythia and Spain, and claims for Scotland the special favour of the See of Rome, as being under the patronage of St. Andrew, the brother of St. Peter. Then the practical case for Scotland is set forth in clear and eloquent terms.

"We continued to enjoy peace and liberty, with the protection of the Papal See, until Edward, the late King of England, in the guise of a friend and ally, invaded and oppressed our nation, at that time without a head, unpracticed in war and suspecting no evil. The wrongs which we suffered under the tyranny of Edward are beyond description, and, indeed, they would appear incredible to all but those who actually felt them. He wasted our country, imprisoned our prelates, burnt our religious places, spoiled our ecclesiastics, and slew our people, without discrimination of age, sex, or rank. Through favour of Him who woundeth and maketh whole, we have been freed from so great and innumerable calamities by the valour of our Lord and Sovereign Robert. He, like another Joshua or a Judas Maccabeus, gladly endured toils, distresses, the extremity of want, and every

---

\* *Papal Letters*, ad annum.

peril, to rescue his people and inheritance out of the hands of the enemy. The divine Providence, that legal succession which we will constantly maintain, and our due and unanimous consent, have made him our Chief and King. To him, in defence of our liberty, we are bound to adhere, as well of right as by reason of his deserts; and to him we will in all things adhere, for through him salvation has been wrought to all our people. Should he abandon our cause, or aim at reducing us or our kingdom under the dominion of the English, we will instantly strive to expel him as a common enemy, the subverter of our rights and his own, and we will choose another king to rule and protect us: for, WHILE THERE EXIST A HUNDRED OF US, WE WILL NEVER SUBMIT TO ENGLAND. We fight not for glory, wealth, or honour, but for that liberty which no virtuous man shall survive.

“Wherefore we most earnestly beseech your Holiness, as the Vicegerent of Him who giveth equal measure unto all, and with whom there is no distinction, either of persons or of nations, that you would behold with a fatherly eye the tribulations and distresses brought upon us by the English, and that you would admonish Edward to content himself with his own dominions, esteemed in former times enough for seven kings, and allow us Scotsmen, who dwell in a poor and remote corner, and who seek for nought but our own, to remain in peace. In order to procure that peace, we are ready to do anything that is consistent with our national interests.

“Herein it behoves you, Holy Father, to interpose. You behold with what cruelty the Heathen rages against the Christians for the chastisement of their sins, and that the boundaries of Christendom are daily contracted. How must your memory suffer in after ages should the Church be diminished in glory, or receive reproach under your administration.

“Rouse, therefore, the Christian princes, and call them to the rescue of Palestine. They pretend that wars with their neighbours hinder that enterprise, but the true cause of hindrance is that, in subduing their weaker neighbours, they look for less opposition and more immediate profit. Every one knows and we now declare it unto you and to all Christendom, that our King and we are willing to undertake the holy expedition, if Edward will permit us to depart in peace.

“Should you, however, give too credulous ear to the reports of our enemies, distrust the sincerity of our professions and persist in favouring the English, to our destruction, w~~h~~old you guilty in the sight of

the Most High, of the loss of lives, the perdition of souls and all the other miserable consequences which may ensue from war between the two contending nations.

“Ever ready, like dutiful children, to yield all fit obedience to you, as God’s Vicegerent, we commit our cause to the protection of the Supreme King and Judge: we cast our cares on Him, and we steadily trust that He will inspire us with valour and bring our enemies to nought.”

The absence of all reference in this memorable document to the church and clergy of Scotland is perfectly intelligible. For ecclesiastics to have any hand in such plain speaking would have been to proclaim a schism within the Church of Rome and thus greatly to strengthen the position of England in the standing dispute.

Advantage was taken of the truce to negotiate the exchange or ransom of prisoners on both sides. Mention may be made of a bargain for the release of one Peter Warde as being rather out of the common, and showing what a long start the Northumbrian coal fields had obtained over those of Scotland. On May 19th, King Edward issued his warrant to the mayor and bailiffs of Newcastle, empowering them to ship 1000 chalders of sea-coal for the ransom of the said Peter, but not one chalder more under any pretext.\*

The Scottish Parliament met again at Scone in August 1320, for the despatch of business of a very pressing and painful kind. King Edward’s agents had succeeded in sapping the loyalty of some of King Robert’s trusted barons, and a serious conspiracy had been discovered, having, as is supposed, the

\* Bain, iii., 132.

object of setting William de Soulis on the throne of Scotland, probably on condition of his acknowledging the suzerainty of the King of England.\*

A good deal of mystery still hangs over this plot and the means of its timely exposure. Fordun, whose notes on this subject are fuller than on most others of the time, says the conspiracy was betrayed to the King by the Countess of Strathearn. Barbour states that it was revealed by a lady—"as I herd say"—but mentions no name. Sir Thomas Gray, however, names Muryoch (Murdoch) de Menteith as the informer. Now this Murdoch was in the service of England from 1311† till 1317‡; he may have been employed as an agent of King Edward to negotiate with the malcontent Scottish barons, and have betrayed them all to King Robert. He certainly entered the Scottish service, and remained in it till his death at Dupplin in 1332, or at Halidon Hill in 1333. Be all this as it may, the result of the trial before the Scone Parliament spread such a horror through all the land, that it was known thereafter as the Black Parliament.

De Soulis, who when arrested at Berwick had a retinue of 360 squires clad in his liveries, "outane § knichtis that war joly," was condemned to imprisonment for life in Dunbarton Castle. A similar sentence was passed on the Countess of Strathearn,

\* William was grandson of Nicolas de Soulis, one of the Competitors in 1292.

† Bain, iii., 39.

‡ *Ibid.*, 103.

§ Besides.



which seems to show that she was not the person who revealed the plot. Sir Gilbert de Malesherbe, Sir John de Logie, and Richard Brown, suffered death as traitors. Roger de Moubray died during the trial, but he was found guilty, and his body was condemned to be drawn, hanged, and beheaded. The King, however, remitted this sentence and allowed his remains to receive honourable burial—a favour better understood and appreciated in the days of chivalry than it might be in modern times. Sir Eustace de Maxwell of Caerlaverock, Sir Walter de Barclay, sheriff of Aberdeen, Sir Patrick Graham, Hamelin de Troupe, and Eustace de Rattray, all of whom were arraigned on the charge of high treason, were acquitted. But the fate which, of all others, most deeply moved the popular compassion was that of Sir David de Brechin, the King's brother-in-law.\* It seems that the conspirators, after exacting an oath of secrecy from him, had imparted to him their project; he disapproved of the plot, and would not join in it, but neither would he sully his knightly honour by betraying it. Such, at least, is Barbour's explanation of a perplexing case; which, if it be the true one, leaves one to wonder why the brave Sir David, with a long record of valuable service at his credit, should have been drawn and hanged, while the chief conspirator, de Soulis, escaped the gallows.

Barbour, however, is not an infallible authority on this affair. He tries to make out that Sir Ingelram de Umfraville, who was taken prisoner at Bannock-

---

\* Lord Hailes calls him the King's nephew, but there does not seem to have been more than one Sir David de Brechin.

burn, had been released on doing fealty to King Robert, but was so deeply affected by the fate of his friend de Brechin that he begged and obtained permission to return to England. This is inconsistent with the fact that, on April 20th, four months *before* de Brechin's trial, King Edward issued a safe conduct in favour of Sir Ingelram, to enable him to pass through England beyond the seas with a chaplain, 12 squires, 4 vallets, and 24 grooms;\* and further, that on January 26, 1321, five months *after* the trial, Edward issued another warrant, restoring Sir Ingelram to his possessions in England, "as he had escaped from imprisonment in Scotland, and shown that he had never left his allegiance."†

The manifesto addressed by the Scottish barons to the Pope had not failed to make some impression on him, if we may judge from the tenour of a letter which he now addressed to King Edward, directing him to make a lasting peace with Scotland. In this letter he referred to Robert as *Regentem regni Scotiæ* (Regent of the Kingdom of Scotland), which was a marked advance on the term *gubernantem* which he had used earlier in the year. At the same time he excused himself for having received Sir Edward de Mambuisson and Sir Adam de Gordon, sent as ambassadors from the King of Scots to sue for the repeal of the sentence of excommunication. Edward complied so far as to appoint the Archbishop of York and three others as commissioners to treat with the Scots for a permanent peace, and on September

\* Bain, iii., 131. This was cancelled for one in October following.

† *Ibid.*, 136.

15th, ordered them to proceed to Carlisle for that purpose.\* But the English Court was far from resigning hopes of creating disaffection among the subjects of King Robert. On November 17th, King Edward gave authority to the Earl of Athol, Sir Andrew de Harcla, and others, to receive to his peace, *as secretly as possible*, those Scots who felt their consciences troubled by the Papal excommunication,† and on December 11th he empowered the Archbishop of York to release all such persons from excommunication. Nothing could prove more distinctly the unscrupulous use of spiritual powers by the highest authorities in the Church for purely temporal and political ends.

The proffered indulgence had but a limited effect. On May 11, 1321, five persons were proclaimed so absolved; on February 27th Sir Alexander de Moubray, with 12 "gentifs" (gentry) and 17 servants were received to King Edward's peace,‡ and Sir William de Mohaut and a few others followed later. We know that in this course de Moubray was acting out of resentment for the fate of his kinsman who had been implicated in the de Soulis conspiracy; personal motives may have prompted others to do the like; while there were sure to be a few timid spirits who shrank from encountering the wrath of the Church, and embraced the first chance of reconciliation with her. But as a whole the Scottish nation did not waver in loyalty to their King.

---

\* Bain., iii, 133

† *Ibid.*, 134.

‡ *Ibid.*, 137.

Desultory negotiations for a durable peace were carried on through the summer of 1321, the last formal attempt being the mission of John of Brittany, Earl of Richmond, to treat with the Scots at Newcastle-on-Tyne. But Edward's terms were inconsistent with the absolute independence of Scotland, and proceedings, often renewed, were as often broken off. Christmastide drew near, when the truce would come to an end, and a permanent settlement was as far off as ever, when the rebellion of the Earl of Lancaster plunged England into civil war and withdrew the unhappy Edward's attention from Scottish affairs. A secret treaty between Douglas and Lancaster had been drafted, of which the terms were fully set forth in a paper afterwards found on the person of the Earl of Hereford, who was slain at the battle of Boroughbridge, March 15, 1322. This treaty bound the King of Scots, Moray, and Douglas to assist Lancaster, who is referred to in the document as King Arthur, at all times in England, Wales, or Scotland, without claiming any share in his conquests. Lancaster, on his part, engaged never to fight against the Scots, and to do all in his power to secure a durable peace on the basis of Scottish independence, so soon as his own work should be accomplished.\*

The agreement never was ratified. Lancaster wrote to Douglas, requesting him to fix a meeting at which "we may adjust all the points of our alliance, and agree to live and die together." The letter, which Douglas ought to have received on

---

\* *Fœdera*, ii., 479,

February 7th, did not come into his hands till the 17th. Those ten days probably decided the fate of the English monarchy. Had Moray and Douglas united their forces with those of Lancaster, and, which was still more needful, brought their trenchant judgment and great military experience to the aid of that vacillating prince, the disaster which overtook him at Boroughbridge, where he was totally defeated by Sir Andrew de Harcla, might have been exchanged for victory, and the fate of Edward II. accelerated by a couple of years. As it happened, the operations of the Scots leaders were conducted without concert with English allies. It was a bitter, hard winter, "distressing men and killing nearly all animals."\* No sooner had the truce expired at Christmas, than the weary, wasteful work of slaughter began again. Moray, Douglas, and Walter the Steward—a well-tried trio of comrades-in-arms—entered the bishopric of Durham early in January. Moray took up his quarters at Dermington, but the other two pressed on to Yorkshire, wringing a heavy subsidy from the district of Richmond as the price of exemption from harsh treatment.

The execution of Lancaster on March 22d, and the complete collapse of the rebellion, left King Edward once more free to turn his attention to the Scottish war. "Give yourself no further solicitude," he wrote to the Pope, "about a truce with the Scots; the exigencies of my affairs inclined me formerly to listen to such proposals, but now I am resolved to establish peace by force of arms."† But before he

\* Fordun, cxxxvi.

† Hailes, ii., 126.

could take the field, the Scots were again in force on the English side of the Border, having crossed the West March in two bodies, one under King Robert himself,\* the other under Douglas and Moray. They penetrated eighty miles into England, passing south of Preston; and on their return they invested Carlisle for five days.

Harcla, the governor, who had been created Earl of Carlisle for his defeat and capture of the Earl of Lancaster, was too cautious to venture from behind his defences; and the Scots were allowed to return to their own country with much booty on July 24th, the day before that appointed for the muster of the English army at Newcastle.

It behoved the King of Scots now to look to the safety of his own dominions. It was not his policy to risk another trial of strength with England; faithful to his favourite tactics he moved northward, causing every head of cattle, every sack of corn, every bale of goods, to be driven and carried out of Edward's line of march. It is in masterly, though unobtrusive, details like this that the genius of a great strategist may be recognised, as surely as in brilliant manœuvres and dashing victories. Having made these preparations, King Robert retired beyond the Forth, stationed himself at Culross and awaited developments.

The English began their march in the first days of August, 1322. On the 5th of that month they were at Gosford in East Lothian.† So faithfully had King Robert's instructions been carried out, that all

---

\* *Lanercost*, 246.

† *Bain*, iii., 142.

that the English foraging parties could bring in was one cow from Tranent, too lame for the owner to drive away. "The dearest beef I ever saw," dryly observed the Earl of Warenne.\* An unfavourable wind kept the fleet from entering the Firth with supplies; the troops began to suffer from disease and famine; total starvation was not far off, and, after lying three days in Edinburgh and Leith, Edward was forced to order a retreat. Then was the moment for Bruce to strike in. Douglas was sent to hang on the rear guard of the dispirited host, and defeated the English light horse in a brisk encounter near Melrose. But he was not strong enough to prevent the invaders doing a vast amount of mischief. Holyrood and Melrose Abbeys were sacked; the prior of Melrose with another monk and two lay brethren were slain in defending their property, and the beautiful monastery of Dryburgh was burnt to the ground. All this was fair reprisal, no doubt, for similar senseless outrages committed by the Scots in their raids during the spring and summer.

Widespread as the desolation had been on both sides of the Border during these months, the year was not to close without further mischief. King Robert crossed the Solway with a large force on October 1st, and, after wasting the valley of the

---

\* *The Brus*, cxxxiv., 73. "A sarcastical and ill-timed reflection," observes Hailes, with less than his usual urbanity. There is Edward's own authority confirming the accounts given by Barbour and Fordun of the extreme scarcity. On September 17th he wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, begging him to send money in haste, for "he had found neither man nor beast in the Lothians, and intended to winter on the Border for its safety" (Bain, iii., 144.)

Eden, turned eastward into Durham. Another party of Scots besieged Bamborough Castle in Northumberland. Sir Roger de Horsley, the former governor of Berwick, bought off the besiegers, for which he was severely reprimanded by King Edward. This was, said the King, to Sir Roger's "dishonour and shame, seeing that he had the stronger force," \* a condition of success which King Edward himself had found, on more occasions than one, to be not altogether infallible.

Norham Castle was also beset at this time, not, as Lord Hailes says, with "a numerous army," but, as the governor, Sir Thomas Gray, wrote to King Edward, by 100 men-at-arms and 100 hobelars. †

But King Robert abandoned all attempts for these minor prizes in favour of a far richer one that seemed almost within his grasp. King Edward lay at Biland Abbey in Yorkshire, and thither the Bruce, concentrating all available force, marched at high speed. On October 14th he found the English, under the Earl of Richmond, strongly posted on a ridge between Biland and Rievaulx, commanding a narrow pass which led to King Edward's quarters. A council of war was held by the Scottish leaders. Douglas undertook to carry the entrance to the pass, which was held by Sir Thomas Uchtred and Sir Ralph de Cobham, and the King consented to his attacking at once. The Earl of Moray, ever a friendly rival of the Douglas in feats of chivalry, and jealous of the distinction thus afforded to him, left his own division

\* Bain, iii., 145.

† *Ibid.*



and joined Douglas as a volunteer. De Cobham was reputed the best knight of his day in England, and his position was almost impregnable from attack in front. Great stones were rolled down the slopes, making havoc in the Scottish ranks, and the English archers kept up a hot fire. It seemed to King Robert that Douglas had undertaken something beyond his strength; so he sent forward the Highlanders and Islesmen to his support. These active fellows scaled the crags on either side of the pass, meaning to take de Cobham on the flanks. But on arriving at the top, they found themselves face to face with the main body under Richmond. Without a moment's hesitation the Highlanders formed for the attack, and charged the English so impetuously that these broke and fled. It was a wonderful performance, and one not easily to be understood by those who know of what stuff English soldiers are made. Sir Thomas Gray describes his countrymen as behaving before the Scots like hares before greyhounds.\*

Richmond was taken prisoner, and with him Henri de Sully, Grand Butler of France, and other French knights of renown. King Edward escaped to York, but all his baggage fell into the hands of the victors. Walter the Steward pursued him as far as the gates of York, and waited there till the evening, to see if any would come out and do battle with him; but he waited in vain; none would take up his challenge.

When Richmond was brought before him, the

---

\* Com du leuer deuant leuereres.—*Scalacronica*, 150.

King of Scots departed from his habitual courtesy towards his prisoners. The Earl, it seems, had incurred Robert's special displeasure by making insulting remarks on some former occasion.

"Wert thou not such a caitiff," said the King, "thou shouldest pay dearly for what thou hast said."

The French knights, on the other hand, were most graciously received. The King told them that he perfectly understood their position; he did not interpret it as inconsistent with the friendship between Scotland and France that they should be in arms against him, because, finding themselves in England when fighting was going on, it was clear that their chivalry would not suffer them to keep aloof. Three of them, Robert and William Bertram and Elias Anilage, had surrendered with their squires to Douglas, who therefore was entitled to the ransom, estimated at 4400 marks. But King Robert, anxious, no doubt from motives of policy, to gratify a powerful ally, announced that he would send the French knights, free of ransom, in a present to his royal brother of France.\*

\*This was not vicarious generosity on the part of Robert. By a subsequent grant of lands he made good to Douglas what he had lost in the ransom of the Frenchmen. The deed conveying these lands is known in the Douglas archives as the Emerald Charter. After setting forth that the grant was made in partial redemption of the King's debt to Douglas for the liberation of his prisoners, it continues—"and in order that this charter may have perpetual effect, we, in our own person and with our own hand, have placed on the hand of the said James de Douglas a ring, with a stone called an emeraude, in token of sasine and perpetual endurance to the said James and his heirs for ever" (*The Douglas Book*, i., 155; iii., 11).

The King of Scots prudently refrained from making any attempt on the strong city of York, but contented himself by harrying all the surrounding country, carrying his arms as far as Beverley in the East Riding, from which town he exacted a heavy indemnity. The archiepiscopal registers bear their testimony to the great losses sustained by the religious houses, and to the consequent dispersion of several convents of nuns. Finally, about Christmas-tide, the Scots withdrew from the third invasion of of England undertaken during the year 1322.





Sir John of Brittany,  
Earl of Richmond.



Sir Hugh le Despenser.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### NEGOTIATIONS FOR PEACE.

A.D. 1322-1326.

THERE falls to be recorded at this point the mournful story of the disgrace and death of one of the bravest and most experienced knights in the English service.

King Edward's incapacity alike as a civil ruler and a soldier, his tarnished private fame, and, perhaps most of all, his besotted partiality for the detested le Despensers, had bred deep disgust among his ablest commanders. Among these was Sir Andrew de Harcla, whom the King had made Earl of Carlisle in 1322, appointing him at the same time Warden of the West Marches. Early in 1323 it came to the knowledge of King Edward that de Harcla (for he enjoyed his new dignity for such a short time that it may be permitted to continue to call him by the name under which he won his renown) was engaged in treasonable correspondence with the King of Scots. De Harcla met King Robert at Lochmaben on January 3d, where, during a private interview, an agreement

of a most compromising character was drafted. Within a week, by some means unknown, this document was brought into King Edward's hands.\* It contained the heads of a secret treaty, under which it was provided—1, that each realm was to have its own national king; 2, that de Harcla should aid King Robert in maintaining Scotland against all gainsayers; 3, that King Robert and de Harcla should maintain the realm of England at the judgment of twelve persons, of whom six were to be appointed by each party to the treaty. If the King of England should assent to these conditions within a year, the King of Scots bound himself to found an abbey in Scotland for the souls of those slain in war, and within ten years would pay an indemnity of 40,000 marks. It was also stipulated that the King of England should have the disposal in marriage of the heir-male of the King of Scots, under the advice of the aforesaid twelve.

Immediately on becoming possessed of this damning document, King Edward issued orders that no truce should be made with the Scots without his knowledge. De Harcla, it appears, had claimed the royal authority for negotiating a truce, for William de Ayremynne was instructed to search the Chancery Rolls to see if any such authority existed.†

\* Hailes refers to the terms of this treaty, as he read them in Tyrrel's version of *Lanercost*, as being of "exceeding incredibility." But, except that King Robert's payment was named at 80,000 marks instead of 40,000, the statement in *Lanercost* accords perfectly with a transcript of the original indenture, preserved in the Privy Council Records (Bain, iii., 148).

† *Ibid.*, 148.

Meanwhile, de Harcla made no secret of what he had done. The news went forth from Carlisle that at length this wretched warfare was to have an end, whereat there was great rejoicing among the farmers and shepherds of the Border lands.\* But there were plenty of persons in the confidence of King Edward, ready to put de Harcla's action in the worst light, for they were jealous of the knight's rapid promotion. Instant measures were taken for his punishment. Sir Anthony de Lucy was ordered to arrest him at Carlisle, but this had to be accomplished by stratagem. Coming to the citadel on February 25th, and choosing an hour when the garrison was dispersed on various duties, de Lucy entered the hall where de Harcla was sitting dictating his correspondence. De Lucy was at this time the King's sheriff of Carlisle, as well as de Harcla's intimate friend, so there was no difficulty in obtaining access to the culprit. But the sheriff was accompanied by Sir Hugh de Lowther, Sir Richard de Denton, Sir Hugh de Morigeby, and four men-at-arms, besides an armed party which he left outside. This aroused the suspicions of the household, one of whom raised the cry of "Treason!" On this the porter tried to shut the inner gate, but was immediately cut down by Sir Richard de Denton, and de Harcla was made the King's prisoner.

His trial followed on March 3d; he was found guilty of high treason, and sentenced to be degraded from the rank of earl by being stripped of his belt; from knighthood, by having his gilt spurs hacked

\* *Lanercost*, 249.

off; from citizenship, by forfeiture of all his possessions; then to be drawn to the gallows at Henriby and hanged, his head to be cut off and sent to London for exposure on the tower, his entrails to be taken out and burnt, and his four quarters to be fixed up at Carlisle, Newcastle, Bristol, and Dover. All of which was carried out the same day of the trial, probably under the eyes of the friar who so sympathetically describes the scene.\* Under the gallows, in a clear and spirited address to the people, he explained the considerations which had induced him to enter into negotiations with the Scots.

Although it may not be possible to clear the memory of this brave and skilful soldier from all the guilt for which he suffered, yet the clearer light which has fallen on the affair since it was examined by Lord Hailes, would probably have led that writer to a more lenient judgment than he passed on de Harcla. Founding on Tyrrel's imperfect translation of the Lanercost chronicle, Hailes denounced him as the betrayer of his King and benefactor. But de Harcla had proved his loyalty by many years of splendid service, far more effectively than many who continued to stand high in King Edward's favour. At last, however, he seems to have lost all hope for his country under such rulers as controlled her course. As the chronicler of Lanercost mournfully observes—

“ Perceiving that the King of England neither knew how to rule his kingdom nor was able to defend it against the Scots, who were each year doing more and more damage to it, and fearing lest in the

\* *Lanercost*, 250.

and the whole kingdom should come to be lost, he chose the least of two evils and decided that it would be better for the commonalty of both kingdoms that each king should possess his own without homage of any sort, than that such slaughter, conflagration, imprisonments, devastation, and depredation should go on every year."

It was all very well for well armed and well mounted knights to ride forth in search of chivalrous adventure, and then return to their comfortable homes in the south, till the time came for fresh exploits. But de Harcla, during many years in his Border eyrie, had witnessed the heartrending misery brought upon poorer folk, and he was sick of it all. He knew that King Robert was of the same mind, and in going to him he took the only course illumined by a single ray of hope. But of course the fact remains that de Harcla did in the end betray the trust he had discharged so honourably and for so many years, and civil government would become impossible if high officials were left at liberty to shape the national policy according to their private judgment.

King Edward now found himself once more under the necessity of suing for truce. As a preliminary to negotiations and to obliterate inconvenient associations, on March 11th he ordered that the bodies of all traitors, then hanging on the gallows in various places, should be taken down and buried out of sight. His proposals were submitted to the King of Scots at Berwick on March 20th, by the hands of Sir Henri de Sully, the French knight taken at Biland, who was empowered to negotiate the terms. King Robert's reasons for refusing to entertain them were



embodied in a dignified letter addressed to Sir Henri on the following day.

"I see," runs the letter, "from the copy of the letters of the King of England which you have transmitted to me, that he says he has granted a cessation of arms to the men of Scotland who are engaged in war against him. This language is very strange. In our former truces, I was always named as the principal party, although he did not vouchsafe to give me the title of King; but now he makes no more mention of me than of the least person in Scotland; so that, if the treaty were to be violated by him, I should have no better title to demand redress than the meanest of my subjects.

"I cannot consent to a truce granted in such terms; but I am willing to consent, if the wonted form is employed. I send you a copy of the King's letter; for I imagine that you either have not perused it, or not adverted to its tenour."

Edward had to conform to King Robert's wishes, though it was such a bitter humiliation to Henry de Beaumont that, rather than consent to a truce on such terms, he resigned his seat on the council. Finally, on May 30, 1323, a truce with Scotland for thirteen years was proclaimed in the English countries by order of King Edward at York, and ratified by King Robert at Berwick on June 7th.

Notwithstanding the truce, Edward continued to press the Pope to enforce the sentence of excommunication against King Robert and his subjects. It is not easy to see what more there remained for the Pope to do, seeing that the sentence had been in full force for some months already. Anyhow, his Holiness was far too well pleased by the conclusion of the terms of truce, to be willing to do anything which might disturb them. By a singular clause in the treaty, power had been taken for

Robert and his people to procure absolution from the Court of Rome. Of this clause the Pope now reminded Edward, explaining that as he—King Edward—had consented to the Scots obtaining absolution if they could, it would be most improper to renew and publish the excommunication. Further, whereas Edward had besought the Pope not to sanction the election of any Scotsmen to bishoprics in their own country, the Holy Father thought that would be to deprive the flock of shepherds altogether, inasmuch as, during the truce, no English subject might pass to or abide in Scotland, nor any Scot in England.

The King of Scots desired greatly to regain the Pope's favour, with which, indeed, no reigning monarch could afford to dispense for long. So the Earl of Moray went on a mission to Avignon to sound his Holiness as to his willingness to receive Scottish ambassadors. He met with much more favour than was agreeable to Edward, and the Pope, in excusing himself to the English King, has left a pretty full account of what took place at the interview, at which de Sully was present also.

Moray explained that he was under a vow to visit the Holy Land and that he had sought the audience to obtain the necessary indulgences. The Pope delicately reminded him that, lying as he did under sentence of excommunication, he could not expect to do his soul any good by such a journey, and, being without an effective military force, he could not perform any useful service in Palestine for the Church. So he refused Moray's request, adding

that he would consider it favourably hereafter, provided the Earl exerted himself to establish a lasting peace.

To Moray's next request, for a passport in favour of the ambassadors who were coming to negotiate for reconciliation with the Church, the Pope on technical grounds declined to comply, though he consented to direct all the Princes, through whose dominions the ambassadors might pass, to grant them safe-conduct. Next Moray handed his Holiness King Robert's offer to join the French King in his intended crusade, or, if that should fall through, his undertaking to go to the Holy Land himself or send his nephew, the bearer of the said offer, instead. The Pope replied that King Robert could not be received as a crusader until he had made peace with England and become reconciled to the Church. Upon which Moray respectfully represented that these objects were precisely those for which he and his royal uncle were most sincerely impatient, but that to secure them, it was indispensable that his Holiness should recognise the position of Robert de Brus by addressing him as King of Scotland. He assured him that any bull he might issue containing that title would be reverently obeyed, but otherwise it would be returned unopened, as the former one was.

The Pope found much difficulty in explaining away to Edward the significance of his consent to this proposal.

"We remember to have told you," he wrote, "that our bestowing the title of King on Robert de Brus would neither strengthen his

claim nor impair yours. Our earnest desires are for reconciliation and peace, and you well know that our bull, issued for attaining these objects, will never be received in Scotland, if we address it to Robert de Brus under any other appellation but that of King. We therefore exhort your royal wisdom that you will prudently tolerate that we write to the said Robert under the royal title. We hear that reproaches have reached you, as if the Earl of Moray had made other proposals, prejudicial to you and your kingdom. You may assure yourself that we would not have permitted any proposals of that nature to have been so much as mentioned in the absence of those to whom you have committed the superintendence of your affairs. Besides, Henry de Sully, a person of known zeal for your honour and interest, was present at the audience we gave to the Earl of Moray. He heard all that passed, and he would not have suffered us, even had we been so inclined, to receive any proposals prejudicial to you or your kingdom."

Notwithstanding all the attempts of the Pope to minimise this concession to the excommunicated King of Scots, it remained of enormous importance. In fact Moray, who had borne a large share of the dangers and hardships by which the English had been overcome in warfare, had now achieved a signal success in the more delicate province of diplomacy. King Edward was not slow to perceive this. He replied to the Pope that, in addressing de Brus as King of Scotland, he had done a thing dishonourable to the Church and highly prejudicial to the claims of the English crown, for, said he, the Scottish nation will naturally believe that the Pope meant to acknowledge the right where he had bestowed the title. He begged him in language almost less than conciliatory, to refrain from mentioning the objectionable title in future correspondence.

An event of the greatest moment to the kingdom

and people of Scotland took place on March 5, 1324. Queen Elizabeth of Scotland, after twenty years of marriage, bore a son at Dunfermline, who was christened David. It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance to the nation of this happy occasion, reviving, as it did, hopes that had well-nigh failed that King Robert might transmit to one of his own line the kingdom he had won with such dauntless resolution, and that so the people might be spared the dreaded trials of a disputed succession.\*

Negotiations went on at York during the greater part of 1324, for the conversion of the truce into a durable peace, and for the ransom of English prisoners. Scottish interests were committed to the hands of the Bishop of St. Andrews and the Earl of Moray, with six other envoys.† On the English side were

\* The birth of this Prince was the occasion of a good deal of ribaldry by satirical English poets. The following infamous doggerel, which certainly will not bear translation, may serve to illustrate the devices by which educated persons strove to inflame popular opinion in England against the Scots. It refers to an alleged incident at the Christening of Prince David.

“ Dum puerum David praesul baptismate lavit,  
Ventre laxavit, baptisterium maculavit.  
Fontem foedavit in quo mingendo cacavit ;  
Sancta prophanavit, olei foeces reseravit.  
Brus nimis emunxit, cum stercore sacra perunxit,  
Se male disjunct, urinae stercora junxit ;  
Dum baptizatur altare Dei maculatur,  
Nam super altare fertur mingendo cacare.

Sic domus alma Dei foedo repletus odore.”

—*Political Poems and Songs*, Record Series, vol. i., p. 40.

† Bain, iii., 156.

the le Despensers, father and son, with ten colleagues. But no progress was made towards a settlement, owing to the obstinacy with which the English clung to their old claim of suzerainty, and the refusal of the Scots to entertain it. Equally impracticable was the English demand for the surrender of Berwick, on the ground that the Scots had seized it illegally, in violation of the papal truce. At King Edward's instance, the Pope withheld absolution from Robert and his subjects, until these points should be conceded; but this did not affect the resolution of the Scots in the smallest degree, for they had long since learnt to discount the terrors of excommunication.

But of all the acts of Edward II. pending these negotiations, the most ambiguous was his command to Edward de Balliol, son of the late King of Scots, to return to England. Living as de Balliol had done for more than a quarter of a century in harmless obscurity on his paternal lands in Normandy, he had fallen out of memory with the existing generation of Scots. No explanation is forthcoming of the King of England's intentions in bringing him over the sea at this critical time, and each one must be left to put his own interpretation on the matter.

In spite of the prohibition against the natives of either kingdom entering the territory of the other during the truce, trade between England and Scotland began to revive by slow degrees. Coal continued to be sent from Newcastle in payment for the ransom of prisoners in Scotland.\* Ships carried

---


\* Bain, iii., 150.

salmon, deerskins, and lard from Scottish ports, and brought back corn in exchange from the south of England.\* But the evil teaching of a generation of warfare had encouraged the growth of piracy in British waters. Record remains of a gruesome affair which took place off Whitby, wherein a Scottish merchant-vessel, *la Pelarym* (pelerin), was seized, all on board slain, consisting of her master, nine Scottish merchants, sixteen Scottish pilgrims, and thirteen women passengers—thirty-nine souls in all. The cargo, valued at £2000, was stolen, and the ship set adrift.†

King Robert was still of an age when life may be enjoyed by men of good health, for he was no more than fifty-one; but his constitution had been strained by the excessive exertions of the last twenty years, and he began to suffer from a disease which the historians of the fourteenth century describe as leprosy, the seeds of which had been sown amid the exposure and privation of the early years of his reign. In spite, however, of frequent attacks of suffering, he diligently employed the comparative leisure attained by the prevailing truce in conducting the internal affairs of his kingdom. In March, 1325, he held a Parliament at Scone, where special attention was given to the needs of Melrose Abbey, which had been utterly wrecked by the English in their retreat from Edinburgh. To enable them to rebuild their monastery and church, the abbot and convent received a grant of all the dues leviable by the judiciary of Roxburgh, to the extent of £2000 sterling.

\* Bain, iii., 156.

† *Ibid.*, 162.



DUNBARTON CASTLE.  
*(From a photograph by Valentines Bros., Dundee.)*





The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, which were interrupted at the death of the Maid of Norway in 1290, recommence in this year, and contain evidence of some of the projects in which the King took most personal interest. It has been already noticed that he almost invariably demolished those castles which fell into his hands during the war; his motive, of course, being to prevent their being of immediate use to the enemy in the event of their recapture. Dunbarton is said to have been the only fortress preserved, and this was put to the use of a state prison. Now, however, that the English, as was hoped, had been finally expelled from Scottish soil, and the lands owned by such of the feudal lords as remained lieges of England had been divided among the adherents of the Bruce, the time had come to put the national defences in repair. But inasmuch as the terms of the truce prohibited the erection of any works in the Border counties, where undoubtedly there was most need for defence, a beginning was made in a part of the kingdom which, at first sight, might have seemed more secure than the rest.


In choosing the west Highlands as the site of a place of arms, the King of Scots was looking more to future than to existing conditions. John of Lorn, kinsman of the Comyns and Balliols and inveterate opponent of the Bruce, was dead; and his possessions, with those of Alexander of Islay and part of the wide territory of the Comyns of Badenoch, had been bestowed on Alexander's brother, Angus Oig or Young Angus, who became Lord of the Isles. But faithful as Angus had ever proved to the Bruce,

he was powerless to bind his successors; and King Robert decided on building a castle which, in after generations, might tend to keep the Lords of the Isles to their good behaviour. He chose a site on the east shore of the isthmus of Cantyre, where tradition reported that Magnus Barefoot of Norway was drawn from sea to sea in a galley, when the western isles were ceded to him in 1098. The ceremony of sailing round each island had been held essential to complete infeftment, and, in sailing thus across the isthmus of Tarbet,\* the whole of Cantyre was formally included in the Norse dominions. It is said that when King Robert visited the western isles in 1315, he conciliated the superstitious Highlanders in like manner by allowing himself to be drawn across the Tarbet in a boat.

The King took a keen interest in the progress of the works at his new castle. Robert the mason, besides his contract price of £282 15s. and a chalder of oatmeal and barley, received £5 6s. 8d. extra, out of the royal bounty, because, in the King's absence, he had built the walls thicker than was set forth in the specifications. The wages of the other workmen may be seen in the accounts of John de Lany, constable of the castle. Besides the said Robert, there were also John and Hugh, masons, Neil and Patrick, smiths, John the carpenter, Donald the blocker, and Neil the plumber. When Sir James Douglas and

---

\* There are many places in Scotland called Tarbet or Tarbert, invariably narrow necks of land between two seas. The name is derived from the Gaelic *tar* (root of *tarriungim*, I draw) and *bàd*, a boat.



TARBET CASTLE ON LOCH FYNE.  
(From a photograph by *Valentine Bros., Dundee.*)



the Bishop of St. Andrews came to inspect the works there was an outlay of 2s. 2d. for birchen boughs to strew their chambers withal.\*

In addition to building operations undertaken for the defence of his kingdom, King Robert busied himself in providing a country house, and in the usual pursuits of a country gentleman, such as yachting, hunting, and farming. Instead of settling at his paternal mansion of Turnberry, he chose a spot in the district of the Lennox, which he ever held in affection because of its association with his early adventures. But the chief cause for fixing his residence on the Clyde, rather than in his native Carrick, was doubtless the easier access thence to Perth, at that time virtually the capital of Scotland. In 1326, then, the King of Scots gave his lands of Old Montrose to Sir David Graham, receiving in exchange some ground at Cardross, near Dunbarton, and the islands of Inchcailleach and Inchfad in Loch Lomond. By a further exchange of half the lands of Leckie in Stirlingshire, he obtained from his ancient ally, Malcolm, Earl of Lennox, two additional ploughgates of land at Cardross.† It was here, in this quiet recess on the riverside, that the King spent such leisure as he could snatch from business in his declining years, amid surroundings very different from the scene of

\* *Exchequer Rolls*, i., 52 et passim.

† Much confusion existed in the ancient land measures. Under the Anglian system prevailing in Northumbria and the Lothians, a ploughgate consisted of 104 modern acres of arable land. But in the west the Celtic system survived for an indefinite time, and in the neighbourhood of Cardross the ploughgate may be supposed to correspond with the Gaelic *arachor* of 160 acres.

populous, resounding industry that may be witnessed at this day in the same place.\*

The manor house first claimed attention, certain additions being made thereto, in order to accommodate the royal household. Payments appear in the treasurer's accounts for such things as verdigris and olive oil for painting the King's chamber, white-wash for the walls, glass for the windows (a great luxury), a roof for the falcon-house, and a hedge which was planted round it. Gilbert the gardener drew his wages, and eighteen pence for garden seeds. Elias the clerk and his son Henry looked after the granary ; Gillis was the huntsman, William the park-keeper, Patrick the jester, and John, the son of Gun, master of the royal yacht.† For King Robert dearly loved the sea, and his nephew Moray was often with him, superintending shipbuilding, and putting his name to payments for sails, pitch, iron, grease, and other naval stores.

Large expenditure on beef, mutton, salmon, haddocks, eels, lampreys, and breadstuffs, attest the liberal scale of the King's hospitality. One source of constant expence was a lion, which ate to the value of £6 13s. 4d. in a single year, besides the wages of a keeper, and the cost of a cage and a house for the brute in Perth. For the lion seems to have accompanied the King in some, at least, of his frequent journeys to that town. The King's physician, Magister Malvinus, lived in Perth, at the house of John

\* The site of ancient Cardross is now surrounded by shipbuilding yards.

† *Exchequer Rolls*, i., 127.

Aylebot, and the royal patient had ever increasing need for his services.

While King Robert was enjoying the unfamiliar ease and leisure of his first season at Cardross, he was visited by a great sorrow, in the death of his son-in-law, Walter the Steward, who expired at Bathgate on April 9, 1326, and was buried at Paisley Abbey. In him Scotland lost one of her bravest knights and most successful commanders, and none did more than he towards securing that throne for King Robert, which his own descendants, though he little suspected it, were to occupy for nearly four centuries.


Early in the same year, the King's sister Christian, widow of Sir Christopher de Seton, was married to Andrew Moray of Bothwell.

The Earl of Moray went to France in the spring, and concluded an alliance, offensive and defensive, with King Charles of France.

The Parliament of 1326, which met at Cambuskenneth, is memorable as the first in which the representatives of the burghs of Scotland sat with the earls and barons. Hitherto they had possessed no representation in the General Council, but maintained, in addition to the separate town councils, an indefinite convention of their own. It is true that in some respects the proceedings at Cambuskenneth were of the nature of a special assembly, rather than of a Parliament, for there were no prelates summoned to it, and some of its acts seem to have required, or at least received, confirmation by the Parliament held in Edinburgh the following year. Moreover, there can be little doubt that the burgesses were admitted for the special purpose of voting a grant to the King



of the tenth penny out of all rents, in consideration of the depreciation of the royal lands in consequence of the long war. The fragmentary records of the subsequent Parliaments of this reign and the next do not make it clear that the burgesses were summoned to them also ; nevertheless, the precedent had been set, and it was a far-reaching one. The presence of the burgesses in this Parliament was of the greater moment, because they were admitted thereby to the discussion and settlement of the succession to the Crown—a question reopened by the birth of Prince David. An Act of Settlement was passed, but unfortunately it has not been preserved. It was lost before the middle of the 17th century, but having been found on the Continent by Sir James Balfour of Kinnaird, Lord Lyon King-at-arms, it was laid before Charles II.'s Parliament at Perth on Christmas Day, 1650. It was ordered that the "old monument" should be recorded in the books of Parliament and carefully preserved ; but before this could be done, Cromwell had become ruler of Scotland, and ordered all the Scottish Records to be taken to London. After the Restoration they were sent back to Edinburgh, but, as the Lords of Session reported to the House of Lords in 1740, the frigate *Eagle*, in which they had been placed for transport, was overtaken by a storm. From the *Eagle*, eighty-five hogsheads of papers were transferred to another vessel which sank ; and thus these priceless records were lost for ever. As the Act of Settlement of 1326 was not among those documents which ultimately reached Edinburgh, the presumption is that it perished with the rest.



Thomas, Earl of Moray.



Sir James de Douglas.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### THE CAMPAIGN OF WEARDALE AND CONCLUSION OF PEACE.

A.D. 1327-1328.

THE melancholy reign of Edward II. of England was brought to a close by his abdication or deposal on January 24, 1327. His son, a boy of fifteen, was crowned as Edward III. at Westminster on February 9th.

The subsequent sufferings of this unhappy monarch, his cruel treatment when in prison and the revolting manner in which he was done to death, are matters which have no bearing on the course of events in Scotland. It is not for Scotsmen to deplore the character of the second Edward as a ruler, seeing that his incapacity in council and his unreadiness in the field contributed almost as much to the success of the struggle for independence, as did the valour and resolution of Robert the Bruce, his captains and his people. Sir Thomas Gray, in pronouncing the following brief elegy upon Edward II., was probably

repeating all that his father, who personally knew the King well, had told him in his favour: "he was prudent, gentle and amiable in conversation, but maladroit in action." \*

The immediate effect of the revolution in England on the prospects of peace between that country and Scotland was disastrous, though there is hopeless discrepancy in the accounts given by different historians regarding the circumstances which brought about a renewal of hostilities.

On the one hand, there is the unimpeachable testimony of authentic documents to the fact that on February 15th, three weeks after his accession, Edward III. appointed Henry de Percy, Ralph de Neville, Roger Heron, William Riddel, and Gilbert de Boroughdon, to maintain the truce made by the late King with Robert de Brus and his "fautours"; at the same time empowering Percy to receive to his peace all Scotsmen who should desire to come.† Further, on March 4th, the Abbot de Rievaulx and Ivo de Aldburgh were empowered to treat for peace with Robert de Brus, and to swear that their King would keep the truce meanwhile. Lastly, on March 6th, King Edward formally confirmed the truce made by his father.

On the other hand, the chronicler of Lanercost, usually veracious though greatly prejudiced against the Scots, circumstantially declares that Norham Castle was besieged on the very day of Edward's coronation, but that the assailants were repulsed by

\* Il fust sagis, douce et amyable en parole; mais mesoerous en fait.—*Scalacronica*, 151.

† Bain, iii., 165.

Robert de Manners, the constable, with a loss of nine or ten killed, and five prisoners, who were severely wounded. Either this must have been a local fray by a party of private marauders, or the friar, writing at a very confusing time, has confounded the dates.

The fact, however, remains that it was the Scots who broke the truce. Barbour explains that King Robert had applied in vain for redress on account of various acts of piracy committed by Englishmen on Scottish shipping, and that therefore he sent openly to King Edward renouncing the truce. Fordun bluntly avers that the bad faith of the English had become apparent. Probably each nation was suspicious of the other. The movement of Scottish troops towards the Border may have been no more than a precautionary measure, but it was interpreted, not unnaturally, as a hostile act. The English King's council were advised that the Scots intended instant invasion, unless peace were conceded on the only terms acceptable to them. Consequently, the English barons were summoned to meet their King at Newcastle on April 5th, where preparations on a large scale were made for the invasion of Scotland. The city of London, says the author of the Pauline Annals, sent one hundred well equipped volunteers—*mera voluntate*—by purely free will. But in addition to native troops, the young King of England secured the services of 2500 German cavalry under John of Hainault,\*

\* Brother of the Count of Hainault. His real title was Lord of Beaumont. He had been serving lately in the war of Queen Isabella of England with her son, Edward II.

for which he agreed to pay the enormous sum of £14,000.

And now once more the bale-fires flared along the Border heights ; once more the Border farmers were summoned from peaceful toil, to reap a bloodier harvest than they had sown. Moray and Douglas entered England by the western march on June 15th. Froissart has given the following description of the light cavalry, of which the Scottish army was chiefly composed on this expedition :

“ The Scots are bold, hardy, and much inured to war. When they make their invasions into England, they march from 20 to 24 miles without halting, as well by night as by day ; for they are all on horseback, except the camp-followers, who are on foot. The knights and squires are well mounted on large bay horses, the common people on little nags. They bring no carriages with them on account of the mountains they have to pass in Northumberland : neither do they carry with them any provisions of bread or wine ; for their habits of sobriety are such in time of war that they will live for a long time on flesh half-sodden, without bread, and drink the river water without wine. They have therefore no occasion for pots or pans, for they dress the flesh of their cattle in the skins, after they have taken them off ; and being sure to find plenty of cattle in the country which they invade, they carry none with them. Under the flap of his saddle each man carries a broad plate of metal ; behind the saddle, a little bag of oatmeal ; when they have eaten too much of the sodden flesh, and their stomachs appear weak and empty, they place this plate over the fire, mix their oatmeal with water, and, when the plate is heated, they put a little of the paste upon it and make a thin cake, like a cracknel or biscuit, which they eat to warm their stomachs.\* In this manner the Scots entered England, destroying and burning everything as they passed. Their army consisted of 4000 men at arms, knights, and esquires, well mounted ; besides 20,000 men,†

\* An exact description of oatcake as still made in Scotland.

† These figures must be taken with the usual reserve. Barbour is

bold and hardy, armed after the manner of their country, and mounted upon little hackneys, that are never tied up or dressed, but turned immediately after the day's march to pasture on the heath or in the fields. This army was commanded by two valiant captains. The King of Scotland himself, who had been very brave, yet being old and labouring under a leprosy, appointed for one that gallant prince so renowned in arms, the Earl of Moray. . . . The other was Sir James Douglas, esteemed the bravest and most enterprising Knight in the two Kingdoms."

Set against this the reference by Holinshed to the contrast between the soldiery of the two nations, and it is not difficult to realise what led the Scots in later years to nickname their hereditary foes the "pock-puddings."

"Bicause the English souldiers of this armie were cloathed all in cotes and hoods embrodered with floures and branches verie seemlie, and vsed to nourish their beards, the Scots in derision thereof made a rime, which they fastened vpon the church doores of saint Peter-toward-Stangate, containing this that followeth :

Longe beardes, hartelesse,  
Paynted hoodes, witlesse,  
Gaie cotes, gracelesse,  
Make Englande thriftlesse."

These gay coats were the liveries of the great feudal barons, with whom it was a point of honour to excel in the splendour of their retinues; but many years of enforced economy had taught the Scots lords to despise, or at least to dispense with, such magnificence. The troops, however, thus described were drawn from the midland and southern

more likely to be right in mentioning 10,000 "guid men." Sir T. Gray says that "restit ge poy des gentz"—they were only a few in number—compared, that is, to the English army.

counties. The English Border riders were quite as hardy as the Scots.

Young Donald of Mar, who had been brought up at the English Court, but had lately joined his kinsman King Robert, rode with the Scottish host. Shortly before Midsummer Day they marched through Northumberland into Weardale, meeting with scarcely any opposition, and wasting all as they went. Then they turned into Westmorland, and we catch a glimpse of them in a letter received by the King of England, who lay at Durham. It was written by his uncle, the Earl of Kent, on July 4th, telling him that "on this Friday," just as he was going to bed—*q jeo devoi cochier*—came news that the Scots were at Appleby, and that he and his troops had remained under arms all night watching for them. He begged to be excused from attending the King's muster, as he must watch the invaders. He had ordered all the empty houses in the district to be set on fire, so as to warn the people to be on the alert—a simple and effective system of telegraphy, but costly withal.

On receiving this news, King Edward ordered up reinforcements from York, and set out to intercept the Scots. He had no doubt a very large army under his command, but the estimates given by different historians, varying from 50,000 to 100,000, must be far beyond the mark. The very greatness of Edward's host put him at a disadvantage in attempting to overtake his nimble foe. Reconnoitring parties ran the risk of being cut to pieces if they came up with the Scots and heavily armed troops could not

move fast enough to be effective. So the English army lay at Haydon Bridge on the Tyne till after July 26th, suffering severely from want of supplies and showing serious signs of mutiny. Moreover, the weather had broken; the Tyne was swollen by heavy rains, and the army, lying part on one bank, part on the other, could not be united.

The Scots were faring well, in spite of the storm. A letter, indeed, addressed to King Edward on July 26th, expresses the anonymous writer's satisfaction because the invaders have been "forclos," by the aid of God, from re-entering their own land; but, so far from being in difficulties, or desiring to return to Scotland, Douglas and Moray, after raiding Coquetdale, were securely encamped on the banks of the Wear.

The King of England offered the reward of knight-hood and a landed estate worth one hundred pounds to any one who should bring him within sight of the enemy, where they could be approached on hard ground.\* Many knights and esquires, therefore, swam the river and rode over the country, seeking to earn the guerdon.

As soon as the Tyne was fordable, Edward crossed the river at Haltwhistle, and the whole English army marched through the hills in a southerly direction. On the fourth day Thomas de Rokeby, an esquire who had set out in quest of the Scots, rode into camp with the desired information. He had fallen in with the enemy and been taken prisoner; but so soon as he frankly told them his errand, he

---

\* En lieu dur et secke.—*Fadtra*.



was set free, and told to make haste and tell his master that Moray and Douglas had been waiting eight days for him, and were eager to do battle. Rokeby guided his friends to the Scottish position, a steep hill on the further or south bank of the Wear.\*

When the two armies were near each other, Moray sent out Douglas to reconnoitre, remaining himself in command of the camp. Douglas brought back word that the English were in great strength, and were advancing in seven divisions.

"We shall give them battle," exclaimed Moray, "though they were many times as strong."

"Praised be God!" replied Douglas, "that we have such a daring commander, but, by St. Bride! if you follow my advice, you will not engage unless we have the advantage. There is no dishonour in stratagem, seeing we are so few against so many."

Luckily the Earl of Moray, who held the chief command in virtue of his kinship to the King of Scots, was not so hot-headed as to overrule the counsel of his experienced lieutenant. Throughout the long story of the War of Independence, there is never a trace of anything but generous knightly rivalry between these two great soldiers—the right and left hands of their King.

The English sent forth heralds, offering to allow the Scots to cross the river unmolested, so as to do

\* Barbour distinctly says the Scots were on the north bank and the English on the opposite side of the river. But the dates of Edward's correspondence show that he was at Stanhope, on the north bank, on August 3d (Bain, iii., 168).

fair, battle on the plain ; or, if they preferred it, that the English should cross without opposition, and fight on the south side. Both proposals were declined. The Scots sent back a message to say that as they had come without leave of the King of England and his lords, so now they intended to choose their own time to return. It is said that on hearing this taunt, John of Hainault and some English knights were eager to cross the stream and attack the Scots without parley, but that the jealousy about precedence prevented anything being done. It was decided therefore that the position of the Scots was impregnable, and preparations were made for starving them out.

For two or three days the two armies lay facing each other ; but the tedium was relieved by sundry dashing deeds of arms. One morning, a thousand English archers, supported by a body of men-at-arms, were sent out to harass the Scots by a flank attack. Douglas, observing the movement, placed a body of cavalry in ambush under his youngest brother, Archibald, and the young Earl of Mar. Then, with a cloak thrown over his armour, he rode to and fro between the advancing archers and the Scottish flank, luring them gradually towards the ambuscade. An English squire, Robert of Ogle, recognising Douglas, galloped forward to warn the archers of their danger. But it was too late : Douglas gave the signal : the concealed horsemen swept down, scattering the sharpshooters along the hillside, cutting some down, spearing others, and driving the rest across the river. Sir William Erskine, having

received knighthood that very morning, used his new gilt spurs to such purpose that, charging far ahead of his men, he was taken prisoner. So many English, however, fell into the hands of the Scots, that his exchange was easily arranged.

On another occasion the English very nearly succeeded in tempting the Scots from their entrenchments. A large body having been sent round by night to occupy a wooded valley in rear of Moray's position, the English made a feint of attacking him in front. The Scots had already begun to move down to meet them on the slopes, when scouts brought word to Douglas that his rear was threatened. Instantly he ordered the troops back to their original ground, and fortunately he was able to enforce the order; for had the two armies once engaged, the concealed force would have occupied the camp in rear of the Scots, who could not have failed to be overpowered by sheer weight of numbers.

That same night the Scots tricked their powerful enemy to some purpose. Leaving their camp-fires burning brightly, they silently decamped. The English awoke to find the hill deserted, and the Scots still more strongly posted than before, on a thickly wooded height about two miles distant. Edward moved along the river and encamped at Stanhope, opposite their new position.

Barbour here either draws on his imagination, or has been misled by his informants. He says that the two armies lay opposite one another for eight days, and that sharp skirmishing went on daily. Sir

Thomas Gray, also, says that six days were spent thus; but examination of the records proves, by the dates on various papers, that Froissart was right in his statement that it was on the first night in the new encampment, probably August 3d, that Douglas made his famous camisade.

Selecting 200 horsemen of the best, he crossed the river at some distance from the camps, and rode towards the English lines. On approaching an outpost he cried—"Ha! St. George! no watch here!" and was mistaken for an officer going his rounds. Then he led his party into the camp at a gallop, cutting the tent ropes as they passed and killing every man who stood in their way. Douglas pressed on straight to the royal pavilion, where, had it not been for the devotion of the chaplain and other attendants, who sacrificed their own lives to save the King, Edward would assuredly have perished. As it was, he had a full narrow escape. But the alarm had been raised: the whole camp was astir, and Douglas, sounding a preconcerted note on his horn, drew off his men with the loss of very few.\*

Returning to his own quarters, Douglas found the Scots all under arms. Moray asked him what he had been doing and how he had fared.

"Sir," answered Douglas, with Johnsonian brevity, "we have drawn blood."

"Had we all gone there," observed Moray, "we should have defeated them completely."

To which Douglas made answer that, in his opinion, the small party he had with him was quite enough

---

\* Froissart.

to risk in such an adventure. Then Moray began to urge Douglas once more to consent to a pitched battle. What follows in Barbour's poem may not, indeed, be an unvarnished record of the facts, but it is too lively to be passed over in silence. Douglas advised his chief to treat the English as a fox treated a certain fisherman. Returning one night from his nets, this fisherman found that a fox had entered his cottage and was eating a salmon. Placing himself in the doorway the man drew a sword to kill the thief withal. The fox, perceiving that the door was the only outlet, was perplexed what to do. The fisherman's cloak lay on the bed; the cunning beast seized it and drew it across the fire, whereupon the owner, when he saw his good cloak burning, ran forward to save it, leaving the door unguarded, of which the fox took advantage to make his escape.

"Now," said Douglas, "we Scots are the fox and the King of England is the fisherman. He stands in the door and will not let us return to our own land. But not only did the fisherman lose his salmon: his mantle was burnt and the fox escaped. I have caused a way of escape to be spied out for us; even if it be somewhat wet, we shall not lose so much as a single page in taking it."

All next day, Aug. 4th,\* a great show of preparation was kept up in the Scottish camp. A Scottish

\* I have altered the dates given by Lord Hailes in conformity with King Edward's movements as attested in the Records, to which Lord Hailes had not access. But it is possible that Edward betook himself to Durham immediately after the camisade, leaving his army in their camp at Stanhope.

soldier, having purposely allowed himself to be taken prisoner, told the English that orders had been issued by Moray that all were to be under arms at a given hour after sunset. Determined not to be surprised again, the English remained on the alert all night, awaiting attack. In the morning, two Scottish trumpeters who had been left to blow deceptive calls during the darkness, were brought in prisoners. They reported that the Scots had decamped again, and were on the march towards the Border. At first this story was disbelieved, and the English, suspecting a ruse, remained in order of battle for several hours; but at length their scouts returned, and confirmed the exasperating truth that the enemy had given them the slip for the second time. Their escape—"sumdele wat," as Douglas had premised—had been made across a great morass lying in rear of their position. Over this a roadway of branches, strong enough to bear horses, had been laid, and was taken up by the rear-guard, in order to prevent pursuit.

The Scots had not marched many miles on their retreat before they fell in with the Earl of March and John the Steward, coming to their assistance with 5000 men; for there had been great anxiety in Scotland about the prolonged absence of Moray and Douglas.

As for the boy King of England, he shed tears of vexation at the issue of his mighty preparations.\* His great armament was disbanded at York on August 15th. The German heavy cavalry under John of Hainault, on which so much store had been set

\* Le roy, vn innocent, plora des oils.—*Scalacronica*, 155.

and for which so large a price had to be paid, were obliged to buy remounts at York, for their war-horses had foundered or died under the severities of a few weeks in the open.

Attempts have been made by some of the English chroniclers to account for the failure of Edward III.'s first campaign by making a charge of treachery against Mortimer, whom they accuse of having taken a bribe of £20,000 to let the Scots escape; but, as Lord Hailes points out, this, had it been true, certainly would have formed one of the counts in the subsequent indictment of Mortimer. He was, indeed, charged on his trial with having embezzled money paid by the Scots, but that was a sum stipulated for under the treaty of 1328, the year following the campaign of Weardale. Froissart would have been sure to hear, and equally sure to make mention, of any underhand transactions between Mortimer and Moray; but he never hints at any cause for the failure of the English at Stanhope, except that they were fairly outgeneralled.

During the autumn of 1327 one of the few Scottish barons who remained in the English interest went to his rest, namely Sir Dougall Macdouall of Galloway. He had petitioned Edward II. for the grant of certain lands in Ireland, to compensate him for those he had lost in Scotland, and was told in reply to go and serve the King in Ireland and he would be rewarded according to his "*bon port*."\* He went there, accordingly, in 1316, with his kins-

\* Bain, iii., 157.

man, John of Lorn,\* and seems to have given satisfaction, for he received an annuity, and, in 1326, the year before his death, a grant of lands in Cumberland and Yorkshire.

The action of the King of Scots during the campaign of Weardale has been greatly misunderstood until quite lately. It has been generally believed that his ill health condemned him to repose, while his lieutenants were carrying on the war. Nearly all historians say that he was suffering from leprosy; and so, no doubt, he was, or from a painful disease which went by that name. Now, however, the researches of Mr. Bain in the Public Record Office have brought to light two documents which prove beyond question that, so far from being inactive, King Robert planned and conducted an expedition into Ireland, in order to create a diversion in favour of his generals in the north of England.†

Of the incidents and course of this campaign there is, unfortunately, no record. No allusion to it has been noticed in any of the Irish annals; neither does Barbour, the chief panegyrist of the Bruce, make mention of it, whence it may be assumed that, if it ever came to the knowledge of the poet, the facts were not of a kind to add lustre to the memory of his hero.

The two authentic references to the expedition are these: First, an instrument whereby, on July 12, 1327, King Robert, being then at Glendun in Antrim, grants truce for a year to Henry de Maundeville, the

\* Bain, iii., 92.

† *Ibid.*, Introduction.



English seneschal of Ulster, and his people, on condition of their delivering 100 "cendres" of wheat and the like quantity of barley in the haven of Wlringfirth.\* Second, a letter written about the year 1335 by John le fitz William Jordan, and addressed to Edward III., wherein the writer claims reward for good service done in 1327, when Sir Robert de Bruys was baulked of his design on arriving in Ireland, by treachery—*par faux covine*—on the part of the Irish, as shown in a return laid before the King and Council in 1332, when £50 a year had been granted to him for life.† From this it may be inferred that King Robert was disappointed in the expectation he had been led to form of a fresh rising of the Ulstermen against their English rulers, and that fitz William in thwarting his purpose, had rendered service sufficiently valuable to deserve such a large pension.

Robert, however, returned to Scotland in time to take an active part in operations on the Border. He divided the Scottish army into three corps, one of which laid siege to that object of envy, Norham Castle, where Sir Robert de Manners made a good defence. Moray and Douglas marched through Northumberland to Alnwick Castle, which they besieged ineffectively; though the occasion was one, says Sir Thomas Gray, of many formal combats according to the strict rules of chivalry—*par couenant taille*. The third corps was led by King Robert in

\* The Norse name for Larne Lough. Bain, iii., 167.

† *Ibid.*, 216.

person, and careered unchecked through parts of Northumberland and Durham, seeking what they might devour, which, by this time, must have been little enough. The natives of this district, left to their own resources, bought a truce to last till Pentecost, 1328.

Moray and Douglas drew off from Alnwick, finding it too strong for them, and joined their forces to those lying near Berwick. No sooner did he see the country clear of Scots, than Henry de Percy rode forth on a foray in Teviotdale. Hearing of this, Douglas determined to intercept him on his return, and barred the road to Alnwick. Percy, however, by a night march managed to avoid him, and made good his return to his own castle.\*

By this short autumn campaign the long series of the Bruce's victories was brought to a close.

The English Parliament had been summoned to meet at Lincoln to take measures for carrying on the Scottish war. But the military resources of England were at a low ebb; funds were not forthcoming even to pay the foreign auxiliaries in the late campaign in Weardale. Moreover, the barons were quarrelling among themselves, and the authority of the young monarch, who was under the management of his mother and Mortimer, was far from secure. The debates in Parliament took a turn which can have been little expected in Scotland, and it was

---

\* Sir Thomas Gray, who, as a Northumberland knight and a near neighbour to Percy, must have known all about this affair, presents it in the light of a rout rather than a forced march—"taunt estoient lez Engles mescharnis en le hour de guer" (*Scalacronica*, 155).

resolved to make overtures for a renewal of the truce.

It has been mentioned above that the Scots have been generally accused of having been the first to break the last truce concluded with Edward II., and that there is good reason to suppose that they actually did so. But the Lincoln Parliament must have been satisfied that they had not done so without justification, else it would have been folly to attempt another treaty with a monarch and a people so little to be trusted. For King Robert's action in re-opening hostilities there must have been grounds, unknown to us, but recognised as valid by the English council. A lawyer called John de Denoun was sent to King Robert, then busy at the siege of Norham Castle, with proposals for the marriage of Princess Johanna, sister of Edward III., to Prince David, the heir of Scotland. This was a dramatic interruption of the labours of war. Of course it meant peace—such peace as King Robert had always been ready to accept—peace with honour. It meant that for which torrents of blood had flowed, for which tens of thousands of homesteads had been given to the flames, for which the industry and commerce of both countries had been squandered for more than a generation. It meant that, at the moment when it was least looked for, the independence of Scotland was to be admitted by the only ruler who questioned it, and that she was to gain at length the management of her own affairs without foreign interference. The whole weary controversy, which, but for the resolution and devotion of the slaughtered Wallace, might

have gone by default against the nation more than thirty years before, was about to be solved suddenly and laid to perpetual rest.

Denoun's overtures being most favourably received by the King of Scots, he and Henry de Percy were appointed King Edward's plenipotentiaries for reviving the thirteen years' truce, or, if possible, arranging a permanent peace between the nations. Warlike operations were suspended at once, and, other plenipotentiaries having been appointed, preliminary articles were drawn up at Newcastle on November 23d, Douglas and Mortimer acting as the principal commissioners on either side.

On December 10, 1327, Edward III. issued summons to his Parliament to meet at York on February 8th following, to deliberate on the terms to be submitted to the commissioners. A temporary truce was concluded on January 25, 1328, and one hundred Scots received safe-conducts to pass to York to attend the deliberations, King Edward instructing his officials to treat them with proper respect.

The Scots, being undoubtedly in the stronger position of the two nations, were able to insist, as a preliminary to all other conditions, that the English claim to superiority should be absolutely renounced. This was enacted at York on March 1st. King Edward "willed and consented, that the said kingdom, according to its ancient boundaries observed in the days of Alexander III., should remain unto Robert King of Scots, his heirs and successors, free and divided from the Kingdom of England, without any subjection, right of service, claim or demand

whatever ; and that all writings which might have been executed at any time to the contrary should be held as void and of no effect." \*

In the Chronicle of Lanercost this concession is attributed, in the first place, to the evil counsel—*pessimo consilio*—of the Queen Dowager of England and of Mortimer, who undoubtedly directed the national policy during the boyhood of the King ; and, in the second place, to the arrival, while Parliament was sitting, of the news that Charles, King of France and Navarre, was dead. Edward III. claimed to be nearest heir to his throne, and wished to have the Scottish quarrel off his hands, so that he might be free to vindicate his title.

The chief obstacle to amicable relations having been thus removed, the remaining articles of the peace were easily agreed to. The York Parliament was prorogued and met again at Northampton, where the final treaty was arranged. Of this, neither the original nor any transcript has been preserved, but Lord Hailes drew up the following summary of its provisions, collected "from a careful examination of public instruments and of the writings of ancient historians" :

1. There shall be a perpetual peace between the two kingdoms of England and Scotland.

2. The stone on which the Kings of Scotland were wont to sit at the time of their coronation shall be restored to the Scots.

3. The King of England engages to employ his good offices at the Papal Court for obtaining the revocation of all spiritual processes depending before the Holy See against the King of Scots or against his kingdom or subjects.

---

\* Hailes, ii., 157.

4. For these causes and in order to make reparation for the ravages committed in England by the Scots, the King of Scots shall pay 30,000 marks (£20,000) to the King of England, to be paid at the rate of 10,000 marks annually on St. John's day.\*

5. Restitution shall be made of the possessions belonging to ecclesiastics in either kingdom, whereof they may have been deprived during the war.

6. But there shall not be any restitution made of inheritances which have fallen into the hands of the King of England or of the King of Scots, by reason of the war between the two nations, or through the forfeiture of previous possessors.

7. But Thomas Lord Wake of Liddel, Henry de Beaumont Earl of Buchan, † and Henry de Percy ‡ shall be restored to their lordships, lands and estates, whereof the King of Scots, by reason of the war between the two nations, had taken possession.

8. Johanna, sister of the King of England, shall be given in marriage to David, the son and heir of the King of Scots.

9. The King of Scots shall provide the Princess Johanna in a jointure of £2000 yearly, secured on lands and rents, according to a reasonable estimation.§

10. If either of the parties fail in performing the conditions of this treaty, he shall pay 2000 pounds of silver into the Papal treasury.

Perhaps the first point in these articles to strike the mind of the modern reader is the evidence of the enormous political power of the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the adversity which had overtaken the Pope, and driven him to take refuge for many years at Avignon. Ecclesiastics of the stamp of

\* The anniversary of the battle of Bannockburn.

† An heir parcener of the deceased Earl of Buchan in right of his wife.

‡ The lands of Henry de Balliol in Galloway and Angus had been bought by de Percy.

§ *Per rationabilem extentam* (Fœdera) that is, according to a new inquest and valuation of the Crown lands, which had greatly fallen in value during the war.

Anthony Beck, Bishop of Durham, William de Lambert, Bishop of St. Andrews, and William de Melton, Archbishop of York, took the field as readily and as fully armed as any layman; and that not only in defence of the possessions of the Church, but often as generals of an invading army. Yet they were not to be held subject to the vicissitudes of war, but were to receive back their lands on the restoration of peace, an advantage refused to legitimate men of the sword. Then the uneasiness of King Robert and his people, owing to the repeated exercise against him of bell, book and candle, is apparent in the third article of this treaty. It is true that the solemn curses of the Church had proved singularly ineffective as regards the temporal affairs of Scotland. The louder and deeper the execrations, the more brightly fortune had smiled on the Scottish arms; and the greater the favour shown by the Pope to the English cause, the more hopelessly it became rent by internal dissensions, while the object of these denunciations had continued to receive such heart-whole service from his barons and people as has seldom been the lot of any monarch. Truly it seemed as if in this quarrel the Church had made a grievous blunder and chosen the wrong side.

Nevertheless it was an age of deep, if superstitious faith, and the old King of Scots still, perhaps, thought of that far off day when the altar-steps of Greyfriars church had dripped with the life blood of the Red Comyn. Sacrilege and murder under trust had left a stain which it would take all the favour of Mother Church to wash out of the record, and, notwith-

standing that his own soul had already received absolution for that deed from Bishop Wishart, what evils might not be entailed on the Scottish people whom he loved, and on his son in whom so many hopes had their centre, unless they too were reconciled with the spiritual powers. No, the Church was still, and was to remain for two centuries more, the strongest political force in Europe, and no treaty could be satisfactory unless it were drawn to secure her favour.

Finally, the Papal Court was duly alive to its own interest, and, forasmuch as instances were not unknown where "perpetual peace" had been swallowed up in war, almost before the ink of the signatures had dried, it was common prudence to insert the tenth and last article, which secured a solid advantage to God's Vicegerent in the event of anything going wrong.

Notice may be made of the exceptions to the stipulations that the subjects of either King should not re-possess the lands which they had held of the other King before the war, for in the end these proved fatal to the maintenance of peace. These exceptions were all made in favour of English barons. It is true that a year later, May 12, 1329, Sir James Douglas received back his ancient possession of Fawdon in Northumberland, and all the other lands in England forfeited by his father William de Douglas, but this was a special act of favour (*de gratia nostra speciali*) by King Edward.\* The reason for exempting Percy, Wake, Beaumont and de la Touche

---

\* *Fœdera*.



from the loss of their lands in Scotland, is said by Sir Thomas Gray to have been that these lords would not agree to the treaty unless this were done, "de quoy," says he, "puis enavoient grant mal."

Besides the above articles mentioned by Lord Hailes, provision was made for returning to the Scots the celebrated Ragman Roll, in which the Scots landowners had done fealty to Edward I. and the bit of the true Cross which the Scots called the Black Rood.\* Lord Hailes inserts, as the second article in the treaty, a stipulation for the return to Scotland of the Coronation Stone, founding on a writ which he quotes, issued by Edward III. on July 1, 1328, to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, directing them to deliver it to the Sheriffs of London, who were to carry it to the Queen-Mother, because his council had agreed at the Parliament of Northampton that it should be sent to Scotland. It is, however, stated distinctly in the chronicle of Lanercost that the people of London—*Londinenses*—would on no account agree to part with this stone, and, as a matter of fact, they never have done so.

The conditions of peace were submitted to King Robert's Parliament assembled in Edinburgh in March, 1328, and approved by them.


---

\* *Lanercost*, 261.





The Earls of Carrick.



Sir Alexander de Seton.

## CHAPTER XV.

### DEATH OF THE QUEEN OF SCOTS AND MARRIAGE OF THE PRINCE.

A.D. 1328.

**E**LIZABETH, the consort and second wife of King Robert of Scotland, did not live to witness the fulfilment of her husband's life-work, for she died on October 26, 1327. Of her character and appearance no memorial has been preserved. She was the second daughter of Richard de Burgh or Bourke, Earl of Ulster, the most powerful of the English barons in Ireland, and married Robert de Brus while he was still about the English court. During her long captivity in England, from the battle of Methven in 1306, till after that of Bannockburn in 1314, she was treated with the consideration due, if not to her rank as countess, which she lost by the forfeiture by her husband of the earldom of Carrick, at least to that of an earl's daughter.

In March 1314, Edward II., who was then preparing for his great campaign in Scotland, ordered the

removal of "Elizabeth, wife of Robert de Brus," from the Abbey of Barking to Rochester Castle, where she was to have a sufficient chamber and 20s. a week for her expenses. She was to be allowed to take exercise within the castle and the Priory of St. Andrew, at suitable times and under a sure guard, and provision was made for her retinue consisting of three Englishmen and an English woman.\* After his great defeat she was brought to King Edward at York on July 18th; thence, on October 2d, she was removed with her sister-in-law and daughter to Carlisle for exchange with English prisoners,† where £8 was paid for two casks of wine for her use.

From the scanty Scottish Exchequer Rolls it may be gathered that at Cardross she drove in an open carriage and pair,‡ that she possessed a quantity of silver plate,§ and that the last recorded act of her life was the gift of an ornament—*quædam frontalis*—to the altar of St. Mary at Dunfermline.¶ The details of her legacies to her personal attendants are not without interest, reflecting, as they do, light upon the manners of a distant day and a simple state of society. Elizabeth de Denton, *domicilla* (lady in waiting), received £66, 13s. 4d.; among other beneficiaries were the Queen's two grooms, William and Gilbert, each receiving £1, *in complementum*, as did also Esota, the washerwoman, Alan the chandler, David of the wardrobe, and others.¶¶

The Queen of Scots died at Cullen, where the

\* Bain, iii., 68.


† *Ibid.*, 74.

‡ *Exchequer Rolls*, i. 255.

§ *Ibid.*, 212.

|| *Ibid.*, i., 239.

¶¶ *Ibid.*, 217.



DUNFERMLINE ABBEY, REFECTORY.  
*(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)*



King founded a chaplainry worth £4 a year "to pray for the soule of Elizabeth his spouse, quene of Scottis, quhilk deceassit in our said burgh of Culane, and her bowallis erdit \* in oure Lady Kirk thair of." Of her children mention will be made hereafter.

The national mourning for the Queen was merged in the brighter occupation of preparing for the wedding of her son. Peter the mechanic (*Petrus machinarum*), a Flemish trader in Berwick, was sent to purchase in foreign markets certain materials which could not be bought at home, such as cloths, furs, and spices, on which he was allowed to charge a commission of 10 per cent. The cloth for the knights' robes, the gift of the King, cost £173, 9s. 2d., and for the esquires and valets, £90. Hoods and capes of vair, miniver, squirrel's and other fur, and of lambskin were also provided. For the household, a great store of linen was laid in, besides 4360 lbs. of almonds, 600 lbs. of rice, 40 loaves of sugar, 180 lbs. of pepper, and mace, nutmegs, saffron, coarse sugar in barrels, in abundance. Twenty tuns of wine cost £75 and, strange to say, 2200 eels in barrels—proviender which would be very unpalatable to modern Scots. The whole bill for the first cargo (for Peter had to take two trips) came to £941, 0s. 6d., a vast sum in those days.

Another trader, Thomas de Carnock (?) was also sent to Flanders to buy silks, satins, and other valuables, at a cost of £400, but the King, by a letter under his own hand, exempted his accounts from audit because he was so well assured of the fidelity

\* Earthed, *i. e.*, buried.

of Thomas as an agent; whereby we are deprived of a knowledge of all particulars, except that a gold seal and silver gilt chain for King Robert, and a silver seal and chain for the bridegroom, his son, cost together £28, 16s. \*

In addition to all this heavy expense, the household expenses at the marriage came to £966, 10s. 10d., besides immense quantities of oats and malt, lampreys, sturgeons, salt, coals, etc., 171 oxen, 413 sheep, 50 tuns of wine, and so on. It was a great occasion and it must have been a novel pleasure to the officials of both countries to spend money in good things, instead of perpetual drain for engines of war and payment of troops. After the wedding guests had departed from Berwick, Simon of Salton stayed behind to look after the fragments which remained. He accounted for six tuns of wine and a great weight of provisions and live-stock which had not been consumed. The pay of the cooks at this great feast came to £25, 6s. 8d., but the minstrels received no less than £66, 15s. 4d.

King Robert's new gold seal and chain were not destined to grace the wedding. His growing infirmity kept him at Cardross, when the heir apparent, now created Earl of Carrick,† set out early in July to meet his bride. He rode with a numerous train, halting for the night at Lanark and Wedale, and reaching Berwick on the third day. Thence, before

---

\* *Exchequer Rolls*, cxvi.

† At the present day one of the titles of the Prince of Wales is Earl of Carrick, under which designation his toast is always honoured in Ayrshire.

his wedding, he paid a visit to Coldingham Priory, apparently with a very large party, for they consumed six bullocks—*de quibus nemo respondet*—"for which nobody answers." \*

The boy bridegroom was only four years old, and the bride but six,—Princess Johanna of the Tower, as she was called, from having been born in that place of gloomy memories. Moray and Douglas acted for the absent King of Scots and received the Princess from the hands of the Queen Dowager of England and the English commissioners, for King Edward was not present in person.

It must have been a strange sight, such as had scarcely been witnessed since the days when the first Edward held his court at Berwick to adjudge the claims to the Scottish crown, to see the people of both countries merrymaking together beneath the walls of that grim old town, for the possession of which they had often fought so fiercely. The knights, too, the paladins of chivalry, must have been glad to fraternise; for, after all, most of them were of a common race, whose nationality had been decided by the accident of whether their most valuable possessions lay to the north or south of the Border. The bonds of kinsmanship or marriage, which had been so sorely strained by the war, were easily resumed, and the freemasonry of the knightly code was as powerful in peace as in war.

The style of the letters passing between the two courts offers a curious contrast to the tone which had long prevailed. There is no more mention of "the

---

\* *Exchequer Rolls*, i., 191.



rebel Robert de Brus, lately Earl of Carrick," but Edward III. addresses himself to "the magnificent Prince Sir Robert, by the grace of God King of Scots, his dearest friend, greeting and embraces of sincere affection" (August 9, 1328).\*

The English records are full of pardons to King Edward's subjects for adhering to the Scots in the late war, and of instruments reinstating the Scottish churchmen and religious houses in their former possessions in England. It is true that in official documents not intended for Scottish inspection terms were still used, less complimentary to the royal house of Scotland than those employed in correspondence. Thus, on December 18, 1328, that clerk must have enjoyed a privy satisfaction who engrossed a deed confirming Hugh de Templeton in certain lands in Ireland, forfeited by William de Say for his rebellion "in company of Robert de Bruys, Edward de Bruys, and *other Scottish felons* in Ireland."†

But outwardly all was concord, and there seemed every prospect of profound peace. There was, moreover, a gratifying change of tone in the papal letters of this year, when Pope John XXII., still holding his court at Avignon, resumed correspondence with the King of Scots. There is no more any difficulty in according Robert his royal dignity. Plenary absolution from excommunication was promised in October, 1328, in answer to the prayer of King Robert's envoys, the Bishops of St. Andrews, Moray, and Brechin, and Andrew de Moray,

\* Bain, iii., 173.

† *Ibid.*, 175.

doctor of Canon Law. The only penance enjoined on the King was that he should not break the truce or invade England. And thus closes this strange chapter of ecclesiastical history; the culprit, upon whom had been poured all the most fearful imprecations of Holy Church, having regained complete favour by obstinate perseverance in the very course which had brought him into such deep disgrace.

During this year 1328, which witnessed the establishment of Scottish independence, there died a prelate, William de Lamberton, Bishop of St. Andrews, from whom, perhaps more than from any other individual, Robert de Brus had received encouragement and counsel in first espousing what became the national cause.

During the year that the see of St. Andrews remained vacant after de Lamberton's death, the revenues, by a singular arrangement, were assigned to those children, the Earl and Countess of Carrick, and the Exchequer accounts show that they used the episcopal manor of Inchmorthach as a residence. In the meantime, the ancestral castle of the Bruces at Turnberry was being got ready for their occupation\*; additions were made to the building, and a park was enclosed. The boy Prince, now in his sixth year, attended the Parliament in Edinburgh. Sir David de Barclay was steward of his household at first, and afterwards Sir Alexander de Seton; besides whom there were a clerk of audit, a clerk of

\* *Exchequer Rolls*, i., 259. Nothing now remains of this castle but the foundations. Turnberry lighthouse stands within its ancient enceinte.

the wardrobe, a treasurer, Sir Robert Toynge, nine ladies, five knights, no less than nine chaplains and clerics, thirty-eight esquires, four boys, three laundresses, thirty-six sergeants, two larderers, twenty grooms, and a page.

It had been stipulated under the treaty of Northampton that the King of Scots should not aid the King of England's enemies in Ireland; and thus it came to pass that King Robert was able to resume friendly relations with his brother-in-law, William Earl of Ulster, son of the Red Earl, against whom Robert and Edward de Brus had waged such relentless war. Among other tokens of amity, the King sent the earl a present of 200 lbs of stockfish from Cardross—an acceptable offering, no doubt, in the season of Lent.\*


Although, as has been shown, the Pope had promised absolution to the King of Scots, and his people, and had, besides, written in the most friendly tone to King Robert in October, 1328, requesting him to receive with favour the papal chaplain, James, Archdeacon of St. Andrews, and James, the new Bishop of St. Andrews, yet there seems to have been unsatisfactory delay in fulfilling his promise. The Bishop of Brechin was at Avignon at the beginning of 1329, on a mission to the Papal Court, attended by other ambassadors, and carrying the significant provision of 4000 marks to facilitate negotiations—*pro negotiis regni ad curiam Romanam expediendis*.†

\* *Exchequer Rolls*, i., 199.

† *Ibid.*, 211.



Sir Hugh de Mortimer,  
Earl of March.



John, Earl of Warenne  
and Surry.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### DEATH OF ROBERT DE BRUS, REVIEW OF HIS WORK AND CHARACTER.

A.D. 1329.

ROBERT DE BRUS had now accomplished his great work, and there was nothing in his age of two score and fourteen years to forbid the expectation of his living to confirm it before the kingdom should pass to his son. But the fates decreed otherwise. He was a physical wreck, and in the spring of 1329 Douglas, who was constantly in attendance at Cardross, began to despair of his restoration to health.

Not that the King was wholly bedridden or confined to the house. He continued to move about his kingdom, as occasion required, till within a few weeks of his death. He paid one more visit to Galloway, the scene of so many of his early adventures, resting at Glenluce on March 29, 1329.\* Thence Douglas travelled with him to Cardross, and both were aware that, to use Froissart's words,

---

\* *The Douglas Book*, i., 172.

"there was no way for him but death." The King spent the last weeks of his life in setting in order his private affairs and those of his kingdom and subjects. On May 11th he granted a protection to the Abbey of Melrose, forbidding all men, on pain of forfeiture, to injure the monks. On the same day he dictated what is known as his death-bed letter, addressed to Prince David Earl of Carrick, and his successors; and here again special injunction was made for the protection of Melrose Abbey and the completion of the new church, "in which," said the King, "I have directed that my heart shall be buried."

Barbour and Froissart both give a narrative of the death-bed scene, and, though differing in some details, these two authorities agree in the main. Of the two one naturally inclines to credit the prose writer with greater accuracy, as being free from the exigencies of rhyme and metre. The chief difference between them lies in the account of how Douglas came to be charged with his famous mission. Barbour says that the King having sent for his chief baron to his death-bed told them how, remembering that there had been much innocent blood shed in his cause, he had resolved, when fortune favoured him, to make an expedition against the Saracens—the foes of God. But seeing that his strength had failed—

"Sa that the body may na wis  
Fulfill that the hart can devis,"

he now desired them to choose one of their number to carry his heart to the Holy Land.

"Quhen saul and cors disseverit ar."

The choice of the barons fell with one consent on "the doughty Lord Douglas."

Froissart, however, makes the King himself name "the gentle knight Sir James of Douglas" as the one to carry out his will; and, little as one may rely on the letter of historical speeches, no doubt the French historian gives pretty accurately the sense of what the dying monarch said. There were so many experienced witnesses present that the substance must have been accurately reported.

"Then," says Froissart, "calling to his side the gentle knight Sir James of Douglas, he thus addressed him before all the lords:

"Sir James, my dear friend, you know well that I have had much ado in my days to uphold and sustain the right of this realm, and, when I had most difficulty, I made a solemn vow, which as yet I have not accomplished, for which I am right sorry. That vow was, that if it was granted to me to achieve and make an end of all my wars, and so bring this realm to peace, I would go forth and war with the enemies of Christ, the adversaries of our holy Christian faith. To this purpose my heart has ever intended. But our Lord would not consent thereto: for I have had so much to do in my life, and now, in my last enterprise, I have been smitten with such sickness that I cannot escape. Seeing, therefore, that my body cannot go to achieve what my heart desires, I will send my heart instead of my body, to accomplish my vow. And because I know not in all my realm a knight more valiant than you, or better able to accomplish my vow in my stead, therefore I require you, my own dear special friend, for your love to me, and to acquit my soul against my Lord God, that you undertake this journey. I confide so thoroughly in your nobleness and truth, that I doubt not what you take in hand you will achieve: and if my desires be carried out as I shall explain to you, I shall depart in peace and quiet.

"I wish as soon as I be dead that my heart be taken out of my body and embalmed, and that, taking as much of my treasure as you think necessary for yourself and the company suitable to your rank which shall go with you on the enterprise, you convey my heart to

the holy sepulchre where our Lord lay, and present it there, seeing my body cannot go thither. And wherever you come, let it be known that you carry with you the heart of King Robert of Scotland, at his own instance and desire, to be presented at the holy sepulchre.'"

Sir James at once pledged himself to the task, by the faith he owed to God and to the order of true knighthood. "Then I thank you," said the King, "for now I shall die in greater ease of mind, seeing I know that the most worthy and sufficient knight in my realm shall achieve for me that which I could not myself perform."

King Robert expired on June 7, 1329, aged fifty-four years and eleven months.

His heart was taken from his body, embalmed, placed in a silver casket, and given in charge of the Lord of Douglas. This was a breach of the rules of the Church, for in 1299, Pope Boniface VIII. had issued the Bull *Detestando feritatis abusum*, forbidding the mutilation of the dead, even from pious motives, decreeing to excommunication those who should do such things, and prohibiting ecclesiastical burial to any corpse so treated. But, as it is doubtful whether Douglas and all others concerned in this transaction had ever been formally absolved from the excommunication under which they had lain for so many years, probably it did not disquiet them unduly that they should incur fresh disgrace. Nevertheless, two years later, in August, 1331, Pope John, on the instance of the Earl of Moray, granted absolution to all who had taken part "in the inhuman and cruel treatment" of the body of King Robert.

The body itself was embalmed and taken to Dun-

fermline, where that of the Queen had gone before. Through the dry records of the chamberlain's accounts the sorrowful procession may be traced, winding its way past the foot of Loch Lomond to Dunipace, thence to Cambuskenneth, and so to the last resting place of the King of Scots. It seems that the King had, about a year before his death, ordered a marble monument to be made in Paris. The sum of £12, 10s. was paid for its carriage, through Bruges and England to Dunfermline, and the mason who set it up over the tomb received £38, 2s. An iron railing was put round the monument at a cost of £21, 8s. 2d. in addition to the gift of a robe worth 20s. to Robert of Lessuden, charged with the work. John of Linlithgow was commissioned to paint the iron work, and 1100 books of gold leaf, bought at York, were used in its decoration. A temporary chapel of Baltic timber was set up over the grave on the day of the funeral, and large sums were disbursed in vestments for the ecclesiastics and mourning for the Court. It may seem rather trivial to dwell on these details, but, in the absence of information of greater moment, every circumstance which reveals the means taken by the Scottish people to do honourable obsequies to their departed hero, acquires an interest which it would not otherwise possess.

It might have been expected that the Scottish nation, which owes its very existence to the strong will and ready arm of Robert the Bruce, would have guarded his tomb with sleepless vigilance, so long as marble and mortar would cling together.




and that in all the coming virulence of faction and bitterness of ecclesiastical strife, this spot of ground would never have been violated—this memorial of the Great King would have been proudly preserved.

Even had there been found a Scotsman so alien from the spirit of his race as to hold the memory of Robert the Bruce as a common thing, unworthy of honour, surely there were noble ashes enough besides in that abbey ground to make it forever sacred. For, so soon as the different peoples inhabiting Scotland had united to form one nation under one monarch, Dunfermline succeeded Iona as the sepulchre of the Scottish kings. Here were laid Malcolm Canmore, his Queen Margaret, and their sons Edward, Edmund, and Ethelbert; Alexander I. and Queen Sibylla; David I. and his two consorts; Alexander III., his Queen Margaret, and their sons David and Alexander. Hither also, in the days that followed the reign of Robert the Bruce, had been carried almost all that Scotland had to cherish of wise and great and good among her rulers: surely her sons would hold the place sacred for all time.

Not so.

On March 28, 1560, the choir, transepts, and belfry, as well as the monastery of Dunfermline, were razed by the Reformers, and the nave was refitted four years later to serve as a parish church. Ruin—ruthless, senseless ruin—fell upon the monument of Scotland's greatest ruler, just as at that time it fell upon countless other relics of irreparable value. So that it came to pass when, in 1821 foundations were being cleared for a new church,



DUNFERMLINE ABBEY FROM THE NORTH-EAST.  
(From a photograph by *Valentine Bros., Dundee.*)



no man could point with certainty to the place where Robert the Bruce had been laid. A grave was found, it is true, near where the high altar of the abbey church once stood, and in the grave the bones of a man, one of which, the breast bone, had been sawn asunder, as one should do who had to remove the heart of a man. Fragments of fine linen, with a gold thread running through it, lay round the remains, and all about lay shattered morsels of black and white marble, carved and gilt, probably the remains of the Paris sculptor's handiwork. A skull lay with the other bones, but who can say for certain that it was the same that the great Plautagenet had desired so eagerly to see fixed to London Bridge, a desire, which, had he lived a few years longer, it is only too likely would have been gratified. All that can be said is that it is possible and not improbable that these remains are those of Scotland's greatest king.


But if his people have suffered the Bruce's mortal parts to be lost, how dearly they keep his memory. So dearly, that there is no exploit so heroic, hardly any miracle so incredible, as not to have attached itself to his story; so that the chief difficulty in writing it has not been found so much in collecting facts, as in refusing credence to fictions which have gathered round his name.

There is much that even the most devoted Scotsman could wish to see wiped out from the earlier pages of the record. His Norman lineage, his hereditary homage to the English King, disgust with the feeble administration of John of Balliol, might

palliate—they might even go far to excuse—Bruce's indifference to Wallace's enterprise. It might be pardoned to him that, having once embarked in treasonable designs against his King, he repented and renewed his oath of fealty. Less can be said in defence of the sorry surrender of Irvine, when, at the first glitter of English spears, the confederacy fell asunder, and Wallace was left to go forward alone. But even here there may—there must—have been circumstances beyond our understanding. Between de Brus, the Norman knight, and Wallace, the outlawed Scottish brigand, there need have been little harmony of habit and feeling—so little as to make co-operation between them impracticable. De Brus may have realised that to persevere at that time without hearty alliance with William Douglas and the other barons who had joined him, would have been simply to march the shortest way to the scaffold. Therefore even in the capitulation of Irvine he may be leniently judged.

But the darkest part was to come.

Renewing his fealty to Edward and ratifying it by the most solemn adjurations known to a Christian, what can be said in defence of Bruce's repeated presence in Edward's Parliament and Council, about the time when Wallace was hurried to death? He was an English subject, it is true, and, as such, bound to regard Wallace, his former comrade, as a rebel, and to serve King Edward faithfully in all things. But if that is held to justify his indifference to Wallace's fate he was involved in the greater dishonour by the secret treaty then existing between him and



DUNFERMLINE ABBEY, NAVE LOOKING EAST.  
(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)



William de Lamberton. Of treachery to King, to comrade, or to both, Robert de Brus can scarcely be acquitted.

Of the more violent crime in Greyfriars Church there is less occasion to speak. It was a brutal, bloody murder, aggravated, as there is too much reason to suspect, by its being committed under trust. The blackest part of it, according to the creed of that time, was that it was committed in a church, thereby making the murderer guilty of sacrilege. In the middle ages that was considered the central feature in the tragedy: to modern minds it appears a comparatively trifling detail. We have come to look on murder as equally heinous whether it be committed in the green-wood, in the streets, or in a place of worship. Men's judgment on the assassination of John Comyn is the same now, though on different grounds, as was King Edward's nearly six hundred years ago—namely, that a worse deed could not have been done.

But whatever may have been his guilt or shortcoming as a man—as a King, Bruce never gave his subjects cause to blush for him. From the moment the Countess of Fife placed the golden diadem on his brow at Scone, he followed a single purpose with unwavering courage and extraordinary sagacity.

By personal charm of manner and address and by a remarkable power of sympathy with men of every degree, he attached those around him and secured their devotion. Perhaps the most direct evidence of this is to be found in his influence over his nephew, young Thomas Randolph, who was taken prisoner by



Douglas on Lyne Water. Violently opposed as was Randolph to the Scottish cause, rudely as he spoke to his uncle when brought before him, he soon became the rival of Douglas in affection for the King, as he remained to the last his rival in knightly service. To this personal influence of the King must be attributed in great measure, not only the fidelity with which he was served, for although many English knights came over to his side, there is not a single authentic instance of one deserting him in favour of King Edward.

During the long warfare he waged, from 1306 to 1327, very few chroniclers attempt to fix the charge of cruelty upon King Robert. It has been shown above that, judged according to the custom of war and the civil code prevailing in the 13th and 14th centuries, Edward I. was far from deserving the outrageous character given him by certain Scottish historians. A similar dispassionate view will reveal Robert de Brus as not only negatively, but actively, humane. In all his many raids in England, it is testified, by English writers of the time, that he never permitted people to be slain, except when they stood on their defence. To prisoners of war he was always indulgent, and sometimes very generous, as in the case of Sir Marmaduke de Twenge, on the morrow of Bannockburn. The nature of the warfare King Robert had to wage was inevitably cruel. The repeated raids on English soil, the destruction of buildings and growing crops and the ruin of private owners, were the only means at his hand of enforcing his will against a foe far more powerful than himself.

The least fascinating page of his warfare was the melancholy expedition to Ireland.

Lastly, he was always exceedingly anxious to be at peace with England, though inflexible in the terms on which alone he would consent to it.

As a civil ruler Robert I. had scant time to develop a policy, but enough remains to show that, had he been longer spared to his country, he would have displayed the same energy in the affairs of peace, which had been so conspicuous in warfare.

During the reign of David I. and Alexander III. the burghs of Scotland had attained a considerable degree of wealth and importance. Though not represented in Parliament until the Cambuskenneth session of 1326, there never had arisen between them and the feudal owners of the soil any of that jealousy and discord which is such a marked feature in the early history of some other countries. The code of chivalry was as scrupulously observed and honoured among the Scottish barons as in any other European court, but it never prevailed to set up a cold barrier of caste between the seignury and the burgesses. The cadets of noble and knightly families were not held to forfeit their rank if they engaged in trade, and successful merchants sometimes became the founders of noble families. There is good reason to suppose that even the gentle knight, Sir James of Douglas, was descended from a wealthy Flemish merchant, Freskin, to whom David I. granted extensive lands in the conquered province of Moray; though it suited Hume of Godscroft, writing in the 17th century, to please his powerful patron, the

Earl of Angus, by declaring that the House of Douglas was of such antiquity that its origin was incapable of "an exact and infallible demonstration," and to proceed to deduce it from a great warrior under an apocryphal King Solvathius in the 8th century. Sir James Douglas himself, if he ever bothered himself about a remote pedigree, would probably have been the first to laugh at such a legend. The original nationality of the powerful family of Flemings, Earls of Wigtown, is evident in their surname.

The relations between the feudal and burghal magnates in Scotland during the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries have been aptly compared to those prevailing in the republics of Genoa and Venice. This spirit King Robert fostered by his care for the townspeople.

Unluckily, at the time when peaceful relations between England and Scotland came to an end in the reign of John Balliol, Berwick, the wealthiest and busiest town in the northern kingdom, was precisely the one most exposed to injury from the southern. The chronicler of Lanercost, writing from the comparative seclusion at Carlisle, describes it as so populous and industrious (*negotiosa*) as to deserve the title of a second Alexandria "whose wealth was the sea, and the waves the walls thereof."\* Some idea of the extent of the trade of Berwick may be gathered from the fact that, at a time when the whole customs of England amounted to no more than £8411, 19s. 11½d., those of Berwick were accepted by a Gascon merchant in

---

\* *Lanercost*, 185.



CAMBUSKENNETH ABBEY.

*(From a photograph by Valentine Bros., Dundee.)*



security for a debt of £2197, 8s, due by Alexander III. for corn and wine. It is true, indeed, that the debt had not been liquidated when that king died. Upon Berwick fell the most grievous affliction of the War of Independence, for the first act of that war was its sack by Edward I. when the inhabitants were slaughtered and the streets ran with blood for two days. No similar instance of severity happened to any other city.

The Scottish burghs derived great benefit from the wise policy of the Scottish kings, who, when Henry II. drove all foreigners out of England, encouraged these industrious traders and mechanics, especially the Flemings, to settle in their dominions.

It is owing to a change in the relations of royal burghs to the Crown which, if not introduced by King Robert, received his sanction and was made universal, that we are able to compare the relative size and importance of the towns as they stood after the cloud of war had rolled away for a time. Under the old system, such burgher paid a fixed yearly rent to the Crown in respect of his separate toft or tenement, and these rents were periodically collected and accounted for by Government officials, together with the fines imposed in the municipal courts and the *parva costuma* or town duties, all of which formed part of the royal revenue. Under the new system, each municipality received from the chamberlain a lease for a fixed term of years of its rents, fines, and customs, paying a rent adjusted so as to leave an income sufficient to meet the expenses of local self-government. Sometimes a feudal lord interposed

between the Crown and the town, and farmed the rents.\*

One remarkable feature in the fiscal policy of King Robert's government, inherited from his predecessors on the throne, differed from that of foreign countries and may be held to be the earliest authentic example of the practice of free trade. No duty was permitted to be levied on imported goods, except of course the *parva costuma* levied by each burgh on all produce, whether foreign or native, coming within its boundary. This was a trifling matter; but the national policy of free trade continued in force until the reign of James VI., when an Act was passed in 1597, imposing a duty on cloth and other merchandise. The object of this new departure was not, as might be supposed, the

\*The fixed rents paid by the several royal burghs in 1327, when peace was concluded with England, are shown in the following table, in which in spite of her many adversities, Berwick still holds the first place:

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
Berwick,	266	13	4	Roxburgh,	20		
Aberdeen,	213	6	8	Cullen,	20		
Perth,	160			Forfar,	18	13	4
Inverness,	46			Dumfries,	18	13	4
Stirling,	36			Wigtown,	18	13	4
Edinburgh,	34	18	8	Inverkeithing,	15		
Ayr,	30			Montrose,	13	2	
Rutherglen,	30			Lanark,	12		
Haddington,	29	6	8	Kintore,	12		
Peebles,	23	6	8	Linlithgow,	10		
Crail,	22	9	4	Kirkcudbright,	9		
Dundee,	22			Tyvie,	6	3	4
Dunbarton,	22			Mill of Mouskis,	2		
Banff,	21	6	8				

patriotic one of protecting home industries, but, as is set forth in the preamble, the far less worthy one of enabling King James, as the "free prince of a soverane power," to acquire the means "for the enterteyning of his princely port." Allusion is made in the same preamble to the immemorial exemption from duty of all imports into Scotland, which is shown to be contrary to the practice of all other nations. The Convention of Royal Burghs remonstrated strongly against this measure, which, they declared, imposed "ane new and intollerabill custome."

Less intelligible than this free trade policy was that under which, under Robert I., a duty was exacted on the exportation of wool and hides. The tax on wool so exported was half a mark (6s. 8d.) a sack; on wool felts 3s. 4d. a hundred, and on hides one mark (13s. 4d.) on the last.

An Act of great importance to Galloway, a district where disaffection to Bruce lingered more obstinately than in any other part of his realm, was passed at Glasgow on June 13, 1324. It was thereby enacted that every Galloway man charged with an offence should be entitled to choose good and faithful trial by jury, instead of being bound to the old code of trial by battle. Notwithstanding this, as late as 1385, Archibald Douglas, Lord of Galloway, protested for the liberty of the old laws of Galloway at all points.

It is well known that the Scottish coinage, before the union of the two countries, had been debased out of all proportion to that of England, so that in



the 17th century the value of Scottish currency was as one to twelve, compared with English. There is an idea current that this originated in the reign of Robert I., but this is so far from being the case that, until the year 1355, Scots money was of equal value with English.

It is true that in the long strain on the national resources which began with the War of Independence and continued until the Union in 1707, may be traced the necessity which drove the Scottish kings, following the example of their allies, the kings of France, to lower the standard of the currency until one shilling Scots was worth no more than one penny English or sterling. But in this vicious policy King Robert and his ministers had no hand.

Art has lent no aid to the imagination in its attempt to realise the outward appearance of Robert de Brus, his companions in arms or his enemies, for the rude profiles on his coins can hardly be regarded as serious portraits. Neither statues nor pictures have preserved their lineaments. John Mair may have been repeating authentic tradition in the following brief passage in his *Historia Majoris Britanniae* :

“ His figure was graceful and athletic, with broad shoulders ; his features were handsome ; he had the yellow hair of the northern race, with blue and sparkling eyes. His intellect was quick, and he had the gift of fluent speech in the vernacular, delightful to listen to.”

Supposing the remains exhumed at Dunfermline to have been King Robert's, which is very far from improbable, he must have stood about six feet high. In days when deeds of arms formed as much of the everyday life of gentlemen as politics do of their

modern counterparts, the union of a powerful body with a strong intellect was sure to bring a man to distinction, provided he escaped violent death on the field or the scaffold. Hence the prominence of men like Moray and Douglas, for before the invention of gunpowder, all combats were hand to hand. Brains were useful, no doubt, but they commanded little respect unless their owner could enforce his opinion by personal prowess. Perhaps no act of King Robert's life contributed so much to his ultimate success as the overthrow of Sir Henry de Bohun on the day before the battle of Bannockburn.

Robert de Brus won for himself high rank among famous military commanders. It was owing, no doubt, to want of funds and resources that he came to rely on infantry armed with pikes and on light Border cavalry in encounters with the heavily equipped men-at-arms and famous archers of the English armies. But his repeated success against these, hitherto regarded as indispensable in feudal warfare, brought about a notable reform in tactics. It is true that Bruce was not the first to discover what foot-soldiers could accomplish against heavy cavalry, for, as Sir Thomas Gray reminds us, the example had been set by the Netherlanders at Courtray, when they overthrew on foot the splendid chivalry of France. Moreover, trained as he had been in the knightly school of war, Bruce was ever reluctant to risk a pitched battle against fully equipped and mounted troops, until the lesson of Bannockburn showed him what mighty results might be achieved by good infantry in the hands of a

master. Eye witness of the defeat of the squadrons of de Clifford and de Beaumont by the "schiltrome" of Randolph, Bruce was able to enact the same miracle on a far larger scale on the following day. The campaign of 1314 conferred on infantry an importance which the subsequent invention of gunpowder came to confirm.

King Robert left five lawful children. By his first wife, Isabel, daughter of Donald, Earl of Mar, he had one daughter, the Princess Marjorie, who married Walter the Steward, and died in her first-child-bed.

By his second wife, Elizabeth de Burgh, who became Queen of Scotland on her husband's coronation in 1306, he had two daughters, Matilda and Margaret, born after 1316, and one son, David, born March 5, 1324. Subsequently a younger son, John, was born, but he died in infancy and was buried at Restennet.\*

Princess Matilda married an esquire called Thomas Isaac, whom subsequent Scottish writers have attempted to dignify by calling him de Ysack. But in fact the alliance was not a brilliant one, though it may have been a romantic love affair. Fordun refers to the husband as "a certain esquire," while about the Princess he observes severely: *De Matilda penitus taceo, quia nihil dignum egit memoria*—"About Matilda I shall say nothing, because she did nothing worthy of record."†

Princess Margaret, the younger sister, married William, Earl of Sutherland.

Besides these, King Robert left a number of

---

\* *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, i., 514.

† Fordun, lxxviii.



natural children, of whom the most distinguished was Sir Robert de Brus, who fell at the battle of Dupplin in 1332. He received extensive lands from his father, among others those of Liddesdale forfeited by de Soulis; and in the charters conveying them he is styled by the King *filius carissimus* or *dilectissimus*.

Another illegitimate son, Walter, owned the lands of Odiston on the Clyde, and died before his father. Nigel de Bruce, slain at the battle of Durham, was also, it is almost certain, the king's son. Attempts have been made to prove the legitimacy of a third daughter, Elizabeth, who married Sir Walter Oliphant of Gask, but the silence of Fordun about this lady is, as Lord Hailes observes, significant. Fordun could not have been ignorant of the existence of a third Princess of the royal house, especially as four charters, by David II., dated February 28, 1364, are preserved among the Gask muniments, showing that Elizabeth was alive at the time the *Gesta Analia* were being written. That King David refers to her in these charters as *dilecte sorori nostre* does not necessarily imply her legitimacy, any more than that of the base-born Sir Robert de Brus was implied when his father styled him *filius carissimus*.

Another natural daughter, Margaret, who married Robert Glen, has been confused with Princess Margaret, who has been supposed to have been the widow of Glen when she married the Earl of Sutherland; but as the Chamberlain's accounts show that she was still unmarried in 1343, and Countess of Sutherland in 1345, there was hardly time for a previous marriage, nor does Fordun make any allusion to it.



Thomas, Earl of Lancaster.




Sir Richard Fitz Alan,  
Earl of Arundel.

## CHAPTER XVII.

### EXPEDITION OF DOUGLAS: HIS DEATH, AND THAT OF MORAY.

A.D. 1329-1332.

THE service which King Robert had laid upon the Lord of Douglas, was one which not only removed from the defence of Scotland her most experienced soldier and perhaps the coolest head in her council, but also exposed him to mortal peril. Not the less would he relish it on that account; but one is tempted to impute to King Robert a selfish anxiety for the safety of his soul and the renown of his name, in thus depriving the boy king and the Scottish nation of the presence of such a valuable counsellor, and of ingratitude in adding such an onerous and perilous task to the long list of duties already done. But the character of the mission, futile and superfluous as it seems in the cold light of modern days, must be judged according to the doctrine of crusading times.



MELROSE ABBEY, FROM SOUTH-EAST.  
(From a photograph by *Valentine Bros., Dundee.*)



Not only was it held incumbent on every true Christian to take no rest till the Saracens were expelled from the holy city, but King Robert and his subjects firmly believed that the guilt which lay upon his conscience could only be atoned for by some signal service done to the Cross. Both Barbour and Froissart, in their accounts of the King's dying words, dwell on the emphasis he laid on this.

“ For throu me and my warraying  
Of blud thar has bene gret spilling,  
Quhar mony sakless \* men was slane.”

So that the King believed that, besides the jeopardy of his own salvation, unknown evils might descend upon his beloved people if no special act of atonement were undertaken. This enterprise, then, which seems quixotic, or, at best, romantic, in our eyes, partook in the fourteenth century of the nature of State policy.

There may have been this further thought in the dying King's mind. Thomas, Earl of Moray, and James, Lord of Douglas, had long been generous rivals in the service of King and country. It had required a little tact, sometimes, to keep this rivalry within bounds; witness that little scene between King Robert and Lyn of Spalding, before the successful assault on Berwick. When Lyn revealed the plan by which he proposed to deliver the town, the King said:

---

\* Innocent.



“ Certes thou wrocht has wis,  
That thou discoverit the first to me,  
For, gif thou had discoverit the  
Io my nevo the erl Thomas  
Thou suld disples the lord Douglas,  
And him alsua in the contrer ;  
Bot I sall wirk on sic maner  
That thou at thyn entent sall be  
And haf of nane of tham magre.”

The dying King may have reflected that, after he should pass away, there would be no one to keep these fiery spirits in harmony. Moray would at once, as Parliament had enacted, assume the Regency, and it might be well that Douglas should have his hands full elsewhere.

Lastly, and perhaps most pressing of all, there was the King's unfulfilled oath to make war on the Infidel. Official oaths of fealty might be broken without loss of honour, a doctrine in which King Robert had proved his belief ; but a knight's vow must be fulfilled at all cost and hazard.

Thus widely different must we esteem the motives which guided him in his latest act from any that would influence a modern statesman.

In conformity with the Act of Settlement of 1318, the Earl of Moray entered upon the Regency of the kingdom, and applied himself to the affairs of government, leaving Douglas free to prepare for his expedition. This was set about leisurely, on a scale befitting such a renowned chevalier and such a solemn occasion.

The material interests of the Church, as was usual,

---

\* *Magre*, displeasure (*The Brus*, cxxv., 88).

were not forgotten. Douglas commended himself to her prayers, and especially to the protection of his patron saint, St. Bride, on whose commemoration day, February 1, 1330, he bestowed lands on the Abbey of Newbottle. The intention of this gift is made clear in the Register of Newbottle, where it is recorded. It was made in the personal interest of Douglas, to secure the special intercession of St. Bride with the Almighty for himself, and by her merits and prayers purchase what was needful for his body and soul. A choral mass was to be performed at the altar of St. Bride within the monastery on each anniversary of the saint, and thirteen poor people were to be entertained on the same day. On September 1, 1329, Edward III. issued letters of protection to James Lord of Douglas, on his way to the Holy Land with the heart of the late King of Scots in aid of the Christians against the Saracens.\*

The difficulty and magnitude of the enterprise were not under-estimated, for the protection was made to cover seven years. On the same day King Edward wrote a letter commending Douglas to Alfonso, King of Castile and Leon.

In the spring of 1330 the Lord of Douglas embarked, at Berwick according to Barbour, but more probably at Montrose as Froissart states, having in charge the King's heart in

“ —ane cas of silver fyn  
Enamalit throu subtilite,”

and accompanied by a knight banneret, seven other knights, twenty-six esquires, and a very large retinue.

\* Bain, iii., 179.

The flotilla remained twelve days at Sluys, in order to give other knights-errant the opportunity of joining in the adventure, but Douglas never left his ship. He received many visitors on board in princely fashion, keeping open table, and treating his guests with wines of two kinds and different kinds of spice.

Alfonso XI., King of Castile, being then at war with Osmyn, the Moorish Prince of Granada, Douglas before leaving Scotland had resolved to take part in that holy war, as it was considered, on his way to Jerusalem. So he sailed as far south as Seville, where, after resting awhile to restore men and horses from the fatigue of a stormy passage, he rode to King Alfonso's camp on the frontiers, and was received with much honour.

There were knights from many lands serving under the King of Castile, for the chivalry of Europe desired no better quarrel than that of a Christian monarch against the Paynim, wherein renown and ransom might be secured to make this life worth living, as well as salvation ensured for the life to come. By none of these foreign cavaliers was Douglas welcomed more heartily than by the English. Among these soldiers of fortune and the Cross there was one of wide-spread fame for his deeds of arms. Now it had been the fortune of this knight to receive so many wounds that his face was all hacked to pieces. He expressed a great desire to see Douglas, of whose renown he had heard so much, in order to compare notes on mutilation. Great was his surprise to find that there was not a single scar on the Scottish knight's visage. "Praised be God!" ex-

claimed Douglas, "I have always had hands to protect my head."

On August 25, 1330, the Spanish host was drawn up near Theba on the frontier of Andalusia: opposite to them, on the territory of Granada, lay the Moors. King Alfonso ordered a forward movement, which Douglas, who rode with his Scottish squadron, on one of his flanks, mistook for a general attack. He carried the silver casket containing the heart of the Bruce slung round his neck, and, being thus distinguished, his zeal for the foremost place overbore the cool prudence with which he had saved so many fields. "A Douglas! a Douglas!" he cried, and made his trumpets sound the charge. Away went the Scottish squadron, determined to be the first to draw blood, and believing that the Spanish men-at-arms were charging too. But, unknown to Douglas, these had been ordered to halt, while the Scots rode on.

Now on the face of God's earth there were no more dangerous fighters than the Moslem cavalry. Many a time had Douglas's battle fury and sinewy arm turned the scale against tremendous odds, but these lithe Saracens swarmed around him like wasps. The little company of Scots were engulfed among them; weaker and weaker sounded the well-known battle-cry, "A Douglas!" It is said that Douglas might have made good his escape but that, seeing Sir William de St. Clair hardly pressed, he spurred to his rescue. Douglas fell, and with him many of his brothers in arms.

In the above brief recital of the death of Robert

de Brus's most faithful subject, reliance has been placed chiefly on the narrative of Froissart. Barbour gives a slightly different account of it, placing Douglas in command of the whole vanguard of the Spanish army. It is not likely that he was responsible for more than his immediate following, if for no other reason than because of the difficulty of conveying accurate commands in a foreign language. Boece has followed Holland, an allegorical writer of the fifteenth century, and Hume of Godscroft has followed both, in drawing a romantic picture of Douglas flinging the heart of the Bruce among the Saracens *before* he charged them, exclaiming—"Now pass thou forth before, as thou wert ever won't to be in the field, and I shall follow thee or die!"

But this is myth of that nature, of which, if history is to be written at all, it must be scrupulously purged.

After the fray the heart of the King of Scots was recovered and having been taken back to Scotland by some of Douglas's sorrowing comrades was buried in Melrose Abbey. They brought home, too, the body of the Black Douglas, and laid it in the chapel of St. Bride at Douglas. The tomb stands on the north side of the aisle and is believed to have been erected some years after his death by his son, Archibald the Grim, Lord of Galloway.

"The effigy," says Blore, "is of dark stone, cross-legged. The right hand has been represented in the act of drawing the sword, the scabbard of which is held by the left. Owing, however, to injury the figure has sustained, the right arm and hand are broken off and lost, from the shoulder downwards, as in the corresponding leg from the knee. The long pointed shield which he bears on his left arm is



TOMB OF SIR JAMES DOUGLAS, IN ST. BRIDE'S CHAPEL OF DOUGLAS.  
(From Fraser's "*The Douglas Book*," Edinburgh, 1895.)



without armorial bearing \* and much broken. The general style of the figure is rather rude, with the exception of the folds of the drapery of the surcoat which, in many parts, are simple and well arranged. The armour is destitute of the slightest indication of chain-work; and it is therefore probable that a different material was intended to be represented, or that the chain-work was represented by colours now obliterated. The feet rest against the mutilated remains of an animal, probably a lion . . . The arch, under which the effigy is placed, appears to be of rather more modern workmanship . . . The shield under the canopy of the arch contains the heart, in addition to the armorial bearings of the family, granted in consequence of his mission to the Holy Land, but the three mullets are now completely obliterated." †

Cromwell and his soldiers have been popularly credited with the defacement of this and other monuments in St. Bride's Chapel of Douglas, while they were besieging the castle in 1651. But in truth the ecclesiastical monuments of Scotland passed into such sorry plight during and after the Reformation, that it would be difficult, especially in this, the heart of the Covenanting district, to assign to any persons in particular the discredit of wrecking this historic shrine. The present Earl of Home, upon whom, through the female line, have descended the honours and possessions of the House of Douglas, has reverently repaired the chancel of St. Bride's Chapel, and this tomb and the other relics of a great race preserved there are safe, let it be hoped, from further desecration.

Enclosed in stone and glass on the altar steps may be seen two heart-shaped leaden caskets, one of which is reputed to contain the heart of the Black Douglas. But it is more probable that they hold the

\* The arms were probably painted on it when new.

† Blore's *Monumental Remains*.



hearts of the fifth and eighth Earls of Angus, the former of whom—Archibald “Bell-the-Cat”—lies in St. Ninian’s church at Whithorn.

The personal appearance of the greatest of Bruce’s subjects has been portrayed by Barbour, writing from the description of those who knew the Black Douglas in life.

“ Bot he was nocht sa far \* that we  
Suld spek gretly of his beaute.  
In visage was he sumdele gray,  
And had blak har, as I herd say ;  
Bot of limmis he was wele mad,  
With banis † gret and schuldris brad ;  
His body was wele mad and lenyhe ‡  
As tha that saw him said to me.  
Quhen he was blith he was luffy,  
And mek and suet in cumpany,  
But quha in battale nicht him se,  
All othir contenans had he,  
And in spek ulispit § he sumdele,  
Bot that sat him richt wondir wele.”

The fierceness of the countenance of Douglas in battle seems to have been a quality transmitted to his natural son, Archibald “the Grim,” who, in later years, succeeded to the Douglas honours and estates as third Earl of Douglas. He obtained his popular sobriquet, not, as might be imagined, from cruel or rigorous behaviour, for he was a wise and painstaking ruler of Douglasdale and Galloway, but, says Sir Richard Maitland, he “was callit Archibald Grym be the Englismen, becaus of his

---

\* Fair.

† Bones.

‡ Lean.

§ Lisped.

terrible countenance in weirfair." \* The same writer adds that Robert II. conferred the lordship of Galloway on Archibald, "because he tuke grit trawell to purge the country of Englis blude."

Among the heirlooms preserved in Douglas Castle is a sword, said to have been given by King Robert as he lay dying to "good Sir James." The blade, very likely, is genuine, but the legend bitten into it with acid is certainly of later date, as attested not only by the characters, which are not earlier than the sixteenth century, but the reference to the number of distinguished subjects of the name of Douglas. The lines run as follows :

SO MONY GVID AS OF THE DOVGLAS BEINE,  
OF ANE SVRNAME, WAS NEVER IN SCOTLAND SEINE.

I WIL YE CHARGE, EFTER THAT I DEPART,  
TO HOLY GRAVFE, AND THAIR BVRY MY HART :

LET IT REMAIN EVER, BOTH TYME AND HOVR,  
TO THE LAST DAY I SIE MY SAVIOVR.

SO I PROTEST IN TYME OF AL MY RINGE,  
YE LYK SUBIECTIS HAD NEVER ONY KEING.

The royal arms of Scotland are graven on one side of the blade, surmounted with a crown; on the other side is represented a heart, towards which two hands point, over one of which are the letters, K. R. B. (King Robert Bruce), over the other, I. L. D. (James Lord Douglas).† It will be perceived

\* Warfare.

† In 1745, some of the Highlanders, retreating from England, under Prince Charles Edward, were quartered at Douglas Castle and carried off the Bruce sword when they moved north. It cost some troublesome negotiation to get it back again.

that these initials are quite inconsistent with fourteenth century practice.

Before taking final leave of Douglas Castle and its associations with Robert the Bruce, it may not be out of place to add to its memories one connected with another great Scotsman. When Sir Walter Scott, broken in health and fortune, travelled thither to study the scenery of his last romance, *Castle Dangerous*, he gazed on the landscape till, it is said, his eyes filled with tears, and he repeated the words, spoken by a descendant of the Black Douglas, as he lay dying at Otterburn.

“ My wound is deep, I fain would sleep ;  
Take thou the vanguard of the three,  
And hide me by the bracken bush,  
That grows on yonder lilye lee.

“ Oh ! bury me by the bracken bush,  
Beneath the blooming brier,  
And never let living mortal ken  
That e’er a kindly Scott lies here.”

There remains to be told, in a few words, the remaining acts of King Robert’s other great servant, Randolph, Earl of Moray.

David II. and his consort Johanna, sister of Edward III., were crowned at Scone, on November 24, 1331. Moray, from the first, vigilantly and sagaciously discharged the duties of Regent. One of his first recorded acts was one of considerable moment in respect of future relations with the Church of Rome. Ecclesiastical interference was

not only the rule in the politics of the fourteenth century; it extended to arbitrary dislocation of the course of civil justice. It is said that a certain man, who had murdered a priest, went to the Papal court, purchased his absolution, and returned confidently to Scotland. Moray ordered him to be arrested and tried. The assassin was convicted, and notwithstanding the Pope's absolution, was hanged. "For," said the Regent, "though his Holiness may free a man from his *guilt*, he cannot interfere with punishment for the *offence*."

Wyntown, in recording this incident, says that by this strict administration of law, and by making local magistrates responsible for crimes committed within their jurisdiction, Moray caused the whole country to become as secure as a man's own house.

But beyond the limits of the realm fresh trouble was brewing.

The treaty of Northampton had been the work of Mortimer, the husband of the Queen-Mother of England. The article under which Henry de Percy, Lord Wake of Liddel, and Henry de Beaumont, Earl of Buchan, were guaranteed the restoration of their ancient possessions in Scotland, to the exclusion of the other lords who had been dispossessed, had been fulfilled only in the case of Percy. The delay in the cases of Wake and de Beaumont does not admit of easy explanation.

Meanwhile, de Beaumont, who had been among the foremost in action against the Despensers in the reign of Edward II., had suffered imprisonment and exile for his share in the events of that period, and

had warmly espoused the cause of Queen Isabella and Mortimer, took part in the conspiracy to effect Mortimer's downfall.

Mortimer was executed on November 29, 1330. De Beaumont then put forward a claim, not only for the restoration of his own lands in Scotland, but for that of the lands of all the other dispossessed barons — *les querelleurs*, as they came to be termed.

On December 1st, King Edward demanded the fulfilment of the treaty by the restoration of their lands to de Beaumont and Wake. Moray still delayed compliance. He could not be deaf to the reports that while the King was urging the fulfilment of a single clause in the treaty, de Beaumont was fomenting an agitation against the whole of it, on the ground of its injustice to all the disinherited lords. Revolutions had followed each other so swiftly in England that nothing was more likely than that de Beaumont and his party should get the upper hand. It boded no good that Edward de Balliol, son of the ex-King John, had been taken under the protection of the English court on October 10, 1330.

Edward III. desired peace, for on March 24, 1332, he issued a proclamation against certain men of his kingdom and others (*et alii*, meaning Edward Balliol and his following) who, as many persons had told him, were conspiring to break the peace made with Robert de Brus, late King of Scots, and preparing an invasion of the Scottish Marches. But Edward was young and weak in the hands of these powerful lords. Within a month he signed a demand on the Scottish Regent for the restoration of the lands of

Lord Wake, one of these very *diversi homines* whose action he had condemned.


Nevertheless King Edward was honorably determined to keep the peace as long as he could. He would not allow the Marches to be violated; so de Beaumont, having with him Edward de Balliol, 400 men at arms and 3000 infantry, adopted the expedient of embarking at the mouth of the Humber for the invasion of Scotland. The other barons with him were Gilbert de Umfraville, Thomas Lord Wake, Henry de Ferrers and his two brothers, David de Strathbogie, Richard Talbot, Henry, the brother of Edward de Balliol, four knights named de Moubray, Walter Comyn, Fulke Fitz Warine, and Roger de Swinerton.

The Regent, who was suffering grievously from stone, advanced at the head of an army to repel the invasion. He moved first to Cockburnspath, in East Lothian, but, hearing that the enemy was approaching by sea, he turned northward to protect the Forth. His malady grew worse, and he died at Musselburgh on July 20th. Barbour and Fordun allege that he died by poison, which, like much other idle contemporary gossip, was expanded by Boece into an elaborate story, to the effect that the poison was administered by a monk, who undertook to treat Moray for his painful malady. Having done so, the monk returned to Edward III., whose agent he was, to report that the slow poison was doing its work. This fable having thus found its way into Scottish history, was diligently repeated by one authority after another, till Lord Hailes exposed its baselessness, exclaim-

ing, "Must the King of England be answerable for all the murders committed by English quacks, even in foreign parts?"

It is not, indeed, necessary to assume malevolence on the part of anyone. There was quite enough in Moray's disease to account for his death by natural causes, under circumstances when it was not possible for him to receive the care and rest needful for a cure.

Of Moray's personal appearance Barbour has left but a short note, probably drawn from his own observation. He says that he was of middle stature and compactly built, with a pleasant, open countenance and gentle manners. Of his capacity as a military commander the best evidence is found in the uniform success which he achieved in many years of warfare, generally against greatly superior numbers while his wisdom as a ruler perhaps may best be realized by comparing the state of affairs in Scotland under his government with that which prevailed under another nephew of King Robert who succeeded Moray in the Regency—Donald, Earl of Mar.



Sir Simon de Fraser.



## INDEX.

---

### A

Aberdeen, Bishop of, loyalty to Edward I., 90; excommunication of, 272  
 Aberdeen, Bruce in the neighbourhood of, 137  
 Abernethy, Alexander of, deputed to capture Wallace, 113  
 Act of Settlement, fate of an, 304  
 Alan, Sir Brian fitz, appointed Governor of Scotland, 90  
 Alban, the four separate kingdoms of ancient, 28  
 Alexander I., the Fierce, death of, 26  
 Alexander II., Lord Hailes on the succession to, 66; decision of, as to Bruce, the Competitor's election to the throne, 67  
 Alexander III., marriage of, 34; sentiment of nationality aroused by, *ib.*; does homage to Edward I., 35; death of, 36; civil war following on the death of, 39  
 Alnwick Castle, siege of, 320  
 Angus, Earl of, *see* Umfraville  
 Angus of the Isles, hospitality to Bruce by, 144  
*Annales Londinenses*, the, 172  
*Annals*, the work of Lord Hailes entitled, 13

Arbroath, letter to Pope John XXII., from laymen at, 272-274  
 Argentine, Sir Giles de, bravery of, at the battle of Bannockburn, 49  
 Argyll, Bruce in, 184, 185  
 Arran, reconnaissance by Douglas in, 146; arrival of Bruce in, *ib.*, 147  
 Arscoll, battle of, 236  
 Arundel, Earl of, leads an English force into Scotland, 246; defeated by Douglas, 247  
 Athol, Earl of, accompanies Edward I. to France, 90; execution of, 140  
 Athol, Earl of (David), captures Brechin Castle, 180; doubtful allegiance to Bruce of, 212  
 Aula Rubra, *see* Red Hall  
 Avignon, Randolph Moray's mission to the Pope at, 293  
 Ayr, Bruce holds a Parliament at, 189, 229  
 Ayr Castle, Bruce appointed Governor of, 112

### B

Bain, Mr. Joseph, historical labours of, 3, 319



- Balliol, Edward de, sent to the Tower, 94; recalled to England from Normandy, 297; joins in an invasion of Scotland, 369
- Balliol, John de, pleads his claim to the Scottish Crown, 40; acknowledges the King of England as Lord Paramount of Scotland, 57; commission considers a claim to the throne of, 62; the kingdom of Scotland handed over to, 68; crowned at Scone, *ib.*; releases Edward I. from all agreements, 69; humiliating treatment of, by Edward I., 70; refuses to comply with King Edward's summons to London, 71; enters into a secret treaty with King Philip of France, *ib.*; is defeated at Dunbar, 75; resignation of, 77; later career of, 78; exiled to France, *ib.*; death of, 79
- Balliol, Sir William de, leads a foray of the Scots, 101
- Ban, Donald, reign of, 25
- Bannockburn, tactics of Bruce at the battle of, 200-203; English commanders at, 203; behaviour of the English and Scottish soldiers before the battle of, 212; position of the Scottish army at, 213-215; battle of, 213-223; magnificent appearance of the English army at, 215; King Edward's remarks on the Scottish army at, 216; excellent choice of ground by Bruce at, *ib.*; Edward de Brus's generalship, 217; final rout of the English at, 218; flight of Edward II. after the battle of, 219-223; English losses at, 220; Scottish losses at, 223
- Barbour, *The Brus* by, 5-7; pensions awarded to, 8; gift of the ward of a minor to, *ib.*; account of the battle of Bannockburn by, 203; incidents of Bruce's invasion of Ireland related by, 240; on the death of Bruce, 338
- Baston, poem on the victory at Bannockburn by, 2, 212
- Bath, Bishop of, King Edward's spokesman at Upsettlington, 57
- Beaumont, Henry de, Earl of Buchan, appointed a Guardian of Scotland, 186; at the battle of Bannockburn, 208; quarrels with Moray as to the restoration of his lands, 368; invades Scotland, 369
- Beck, Anthony, Bishop of Durham, appointed Lieutenant of Scotland, 45; capture of Dirleton Castle by, 95; in command of cavalry at the battle of Falkirk, 97; warlike spirit of, 326
- Berwick, meeting of Scottish commissioners at, 62; Parliament at, 64, 80; sack of, by Edward I., 72-74; a mutiny in the English garrison at, 111
- Nigel Bruce executed at, 139
- assault on, by Bruce, 190, 233
- siege of, 233, 255, 265-270
- fight between de Neville and Douglas at, 248; trade of, 348
- Bigod, de, Earl Marshal, in command of the English cavalry at the battle of Falkirk, 97
- Biland, battle of, 283
- Birgham, treaty of, 44
- Blackburn, Robert de, gallant feat of, 257
- Boece, Hector, historical inaccuracies of, 11
- Bohun, Sir Henry de, combat between Bruce and, 205
- Bonkil, Sir John of, supports the claim of Robert de Brus, the Competitor, to the Scottish throne, 41

Bothwell Castle, Edward I. captures, 110; Edward de

•Brus captures, 225

Bower, Walter, edition of the *Scotichronicon* by, 9

Bowmaker, Walter, *see* Bower, Walter

Breaux, family name of Bruce, 17

Brechin, Sir David de, joins the national cause, 180; tragic fate of, 276

Bretaine, Sir John de, appointed Warden of Scotland, 123

Brodick Castle, Douglas captures, 146

Bruce, Robert, difficulties attending the preparation of an account of, 1, 2; Wyntoun on, 10; authenticity of the chronicles regarding, 11; birth of, 17; descent of, *ib.*, 21; claim to the Scottish throne considered by a commission, 62; first appearance as restorer of the Scottish monarchy, 77; high in favour with Edward I., 81; fights on the side of Scottish rebels, 85; signs a confession to Edward I., 86; attitude of, during the campaign of Wallace, 98; acts a double part, 110; succeeds to his father's estates, 114; list of public acts of, up to the time of Wallace's execution, 121; flight from England of, 128; slays John Comyn, 129; coronation of, 131; names of Scottish nobles present at the coronation of, 132; castles forfeited, 133; sentence of excommunication passed upon, 134; received hospitably by Angus of the Isles, 144; seeks shelter in Rachrin, 145; in the island of Arran, 147; desperate condition of the cause of, 151; adventures in the land of Lorn, *ib.*; pursued by a bloodhound,

154; defeats the English at Loudon Hill, 164; a crisis in the fortunes of, 165; defeats de Monthermer, 166; invades Argyll, 184; makes a raid in Clydesdale, 187; invades England, 189; holds a Parliament at Ayr, *ib.*, 229; makes an unsuccessful assault on Berwick, 190; captures Perth and Dumfries, 191; magnanimous treatment of Macdouall by, *ib.*; resides at Clackmannan Castle, 193; reliance upon military skill of, 199; choice of ground at Bannockburn by, 201-203; orders celebration of mass in the Scottish camp, 203; injunctions to his soldiers by, *ib.*; encounters Sir Henry de Bohun, 205; anecdote of, as to a relic of St. Fillan, 210; clemency of, 224; prepares to invade Ireland, 228; a probable blunder of, *ib.*; marriage of Marjorie, daughter of, 230; expedition to the Western Isles by, *ib.*; invades England, 231; lays siege to Carlisle, *ib.*; attack on Berwick by, 233; second invasion of England by, 235; joins Edward de Brus in Ireland, 239; campaign in Ireland, 240-244; first battle in Ireland, *ib.*; incident of kindness of heart in, 242; returns from Ireland, 244; Pope John XXII. threatens, with excommunication, 251; personal appearance of, described by the Pope's legates, *ib.*; invasion of England by, 269; treats with Edward II. for peace, 270; again excommunicated, 271; masterly tactics before English invasion, 281; another invasion of England by, 282; defeats Edward II. at Biland, 283; reply to terms of peace by Edward II., 292; birth of

Bruce (*Continued*).

Prince David, 296; stricken with disease, 298; holds a Parliament at Scone, 298; sets about defence of the Highlands, 299; builds a castle on Cantyre, 300; engages in country pursuits, 301; chooses a residence in the Lennox, *ib.*; love of the sea by, 302; hospitality of, *ib.*; renounces the truce with England, 307; invades Ireland a second time, 319; promised plenary absolution from the Pope, 334; illness of, 337; visits Galloway, *ib.*; final instructions by, 338; commissions Douglas to carry his heart to the Holy Land, *ib.*; death of, 340; buried at Dunfermline, 341; how his memory has been cherished, 343; character of, 343-353; earlier career of, 343; Wallace and, 344; the assassination of Comyn, 345; courage and sagacity as King, *ib.*; Randolph Moray and, *ib.*, 346; humanness of, *ib.*; as a civil ruler, 347; no adequate portrait of, 352; high rank as a military commander, 353; children of, 354

Brus, Alexander de, defeat and death of, 149

Brus, Edward de, first mention of, 116; gains a victory over the English in Galloway, 183; harries the English Border, 189; captures Rutherglen and Dundee, 196; lays siege to Stirling Castle, 197; command at Bannockburn of, 201; division of, bears the brunt of the battle at Bannockburn, 217; created Earl of Carrick, 226; invades North Cumberland, *ib.*; campaign in Ireland of, 236-244; defeats the Earl of Ulster at Conyers, *ib.*; lays siege to Carrickfergus, *ib.*, 238;

defeats the English at Arscoll, *ib.*; returns to Ulster, 237; crowned King of Ireland, 238; asks Bruce to join him in Ireland, 239; death of, 259

Brus, Marie de, imprisoned by order of Edward II., 139

Brus, Nigel de, capture and death of, 139

Brus, Robert de, first Lord of Annandale, 18; a friend of David I., *ib.*; speech attributed to, before the battle of the Standard, 30; joins Stephen against David I., *ib.*

Brus, Robert de, second Lord of Annandale, 19

Brus, Robert de, third Lord of Annandale, 20

Brus, Robert de, fifth Lord of Annandale, 20

Brus, Robert de, the Competitor, sixth Lord of Annandale, 20; designated heir to the Scottish throne by Alexander II., 41; attempt to seize the kingdom for, *ib.*; a claimant to the Scottish throne, 56

Brus, Robert de, "le viel," seventh Lord of Annandale, 21; romantic marriage of, *ib.*; character of, 77; Governor of Carlisle, 85; asked to resign by Edward I., 93; death of, 114

Brus, Robert de, eighth Lord of Annandale, *see* Bruce, Robert

Brus, Thomas de, and the death of John Comyn, 129; defeat and death of, 149

Brus, William de, Lord of Bremeber, 18

Brus, William de, fourth Lord of Annandale, 20

Buchan, Countess of, crowns Bruce at Scone, 131; imprisoned by order of Edward II., 139

Buchan, Earl of, *see* Beaumont

Burghs, Scottish, wise policy of the kings regarding, 349

## C

- Gaerlaverock, siege of, by Edward I., 106  
*Gaerlaverock, The Roll of*, 105; description of army of Edward I. in, *ib.*  
 Caithness, Bishop of, appointed Chancellor of Scotland, 60  
 Cambuskenneth Abbey, Bruce's compact with the Bishop of St. Andrews at, 120  
 Cambuskenneth, Parliament at, 303  
 Campbell, Sir Colin, chastised by Bruce for breach of discipline, 240  
 Campbell, Sir Nigel, appointed a commissioner by Bruce to treat for peace with Edward II., 227  
 Cantyre, Bruce builds a castle on, 300  
 Cardross, Bruce's residence at, 301, 302  
 Carlisle, Earl of, *see* Harcla  
 Carlisle, Robert de Brus, "le viel," appointed Governor of, 72; siege of, 94, 99, 231; muster of the English army at, 105  
 Carrick, Earl of, *see* Bruce  
 Carrickfergus, siege of, 238  
*Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, *see* *Scotichronicon*  
 Clackmannan Castle, Bruce's residence at, 193  
 Clare, Richard de, English commander in Ireland, 244  
 Clifford, Sir Robert de, campaign against Wallace by, 85; appointed a Guardian of Scotland, 186; at the battle of Bannockburn, 206  
*Clonmacnoise, Annals of*, 236-238  
 Clydesdale, Wallace in, 85  
 Coal, as English payment of ransom, 274, 297  
 Coinage, Scottish, 351

- Comyn, John, influence of, as a Guardian of Scotland, 50; claim to the Scottish throne advanced by, 58; quarrels with Bruce, 102; appointed a Guardian of Scotland, defeats English troops at Roslyn, 112; surrenders to England, *ib.*; sent into exile, 113; sentence of exile conditionally remitted, 116; assassinated by Bruce, 126; cause of the quarrel between Bruce and, 127  
 Conyers, battle of, 236  
 Corbridge burnt by the Earl of Buchan, 72  
 Cornwall, Earl of, *see* Gaveston  
 Coronation Stone, of Scotland, removal of, by Edward I., 79  
 Crab, John, Scottish engineer at the siege of Berwick, 266  
 Craigencallie, Bruce at, 157  
 Cressingham, Sir Hugh de, appointed Treasurer of Scotland, 82; defeated by Wallace at Stirling Bridge, 92; death of, *ib.*  
 Cullen, death of Bruce's queen at, 330  
 Cumberland, considered a part of Scotland, 93; raids by the Scots in, 99  
 Cumbria, the ancient British kingdom of, 24  
 Customs of the Scots and Bretons, forbidden by Parliament, 123

## D

- Dalry, defeat of Bruce at, 138  
 David I., youth of, 26; feudal government of, *ib.*, 27; invasion of England by, 29; battle of the Standard, 31; death of, *ib.*; ardour for Scottish independence of, 34  
 David II., birth of, 296; marriage to Princess Johanna of England, 331-334; crowned at Scone, 366

- Despenser, Sir Hugh le, with Edward II. at Bannockburn, 215; English commissioner at York, 297  
 Devorguila, mother of John de Balliol, 62  
 Dirleton Castle, captured by the Bishop of Durham, 95  
 "Douglas Larder," the, 150  
 Douglas, Sir James, at the battle of Methven, 135; wounded at the battle of Dalry, 138; captures Brodick Castle, 146; the "Douglas Larder," 150; defeats Sir John de Moubray near Kilmarnock, 163; curious letter concerning, 165; re-captures his own castle, 174; success in Tweeddale of, 180; with Bruce in Argyll, 184; captures Roxburgh Castle, 194; command of, at Bannockburn, 201; magnanimous bravery of, at Bannockburn, 208; created a knight banneret, 213; makes a raid through Durham, 231; attack on Berwick by Bruce and, 233; victory at Scaithmoor, by, 234, 235; joint Guardian of Scotland during Bruce's absence in Ireland, 239; victory of Lintalee by, 247; combat between de Neville and, 248; treaty between the Earl of Lancaster and, 279; invades England, 308; generous rivalry between Moray and, 312; assault on the English camp by, 315; receives back his English property from Edward III., 327; Bruce commissions, to carry his heart to the Holy Land, 338; probable descent of, 347; Bruce's last wishes regarding the duties of Moray and, 357; receives letters of protection from Edward III., on his mission to the Holy Land, 358; reaches Seville, 360; takes part in a battle against the Saracens, 361; death of, *ib.*; buried at Douglas, 362; Barbour's description of, 364; relics of, 365  
 Douglas, Sir William de, a Scottish leader, 86; surrenders to the English at Irvine, 87; imprisoned at Berwick, 89  
 Dryburgh Abbey, the burning of, 282  
 Dublin, defence of, 241  
 Dumfries, treaty between England and Scotland concluded at, 108; Bruce slays Comyn in the Greyfriars Church at, 130; Edward II. at, 173; Bruce captures, 191  
 Dunaverty Castle, Bruce at, 143  
 Dunbar, Patrick de, Earl of March, a claimant to the Scottish throne, 56; appointed captain of the English forces in Scotland, 99; urged by Edward I. to proceed against Wallace, 113; gives shelter to Edward II. after Bannockburn, 222; joins the Scottish national party, 239  
 Dunbarton Castle, Parliament at Westminster makes provision for the safe custody of, 123  
 Dunblane, churches at, stripped of lead by Edward I. for war material, 114  
 Dundalk, the storming of, 236  
 Dundee, story of Wallace at, 83; surrender to Wallace of the castle of, 93  
 Dunfermline, birth of David II. at, 296; Bruce buried at, 341; a burial-place of Scottish kings, 342; destruction of the abbey at, *ib.*  
 Dunkeld, Bishop of, *see* Sinclair  
 Dunstaffnage, capture of, 185  
 Durham, Bishop of, *see* Beck  
 Durham, Douglas makes a raid through, 231

## E

Eadgar Aetheling, seeks refuge at the Scottish Court, 24

Earldom, value of an, in Norman days, 26

Edinburgh, the English army at, 200; sack of Holyrood, 282; Parliament at, 328, 335

Edinburgh Castle, Parliament at Westminster makes provision for the safe custody of, 123; siege of, by Randolph Moray, 195

Edward I., directions by, as to the marriage between his son and Princess Margaret, 44; letter from, to the Bishop of St. Andrews, 47; request from the Scottish Guardians to, 53; conference with Scottish nobles at Norham, 55; collects records of homage of Scottish kings, 56; judgment regarding the claims of Bruce and de Balliol, 64; commands John de Balliol to join him in London, 70; prepares for war against Scotland, 71; receives homage of Scottish barons, *ib.*; makes a progress through Scotland, 75, 79; Wallace and, 79; removes the Coronation Stone from Scone to Westminster, 79; invades Scotland, 95; fights the battle of Falkirk, 96, 98; instance of the cruelty of, 100; prepares for a great expedition into Scotland, 104; Pope Boniface opposes the claim to Scotland of, 108; keen pursuit of Wallace by, 113; holds a Parliament at St. Andrews, *ib.*; lays siege to Stirling Castle, 120; scheme of, for the government of Scotland, 122; summons Scottish commissioners to a Parliament at Westminster, *ib.*; alleged design against the life of

Bruce by, 128; favour shown toward Bruce by, *ib.*; hears of the assassination of Comyn, 132; orders a campaign in Scotland, 133; letters from, to Aymer de Valence, *ib.*, 134, 142; sufferings from dysentery of, 135; orders Bruce's sister and daughter to be imprisoned in "cages," 139; lays a charge against Scottish prelates before the Pope, 141; fury of, at defeat of Loudon Hill, 165; probability of ultimate triumph over Scotland of, 166; death of, 167; dying injunctions of, to the Prince of Wales, *ib.*; legend on the tomb of, *ib.*; character of, *ib.*, 168

Edward II., irresolute spirit of, 173; invades Scotland, 187; route into Scotland of, *ib.*; at the battle of Bannockburn, 213; contempt for the Scottish army at Bannockburn by, 215; headstrong conduct at Bannockburn of, *ib.*; flight from the field of Bannockburn, 221; founds Oriel College, Oxford, 223; assembles a Parliament at York, 226; letters from Bruce to, expressing a desire for peace, 227; intrigues of, with Scottish barons, 261; prepares to capture Berwick, 265; sues for peace, 270; adopts secret measures to win over the Scots, 278; boasts that he will establish peace by force of arms, 280; invades Scotland a second time, 281; disgust among his followers for, 289; renews proposals for peace, 291; complaints as to the Pope's recognition of Bruce as King of Scotland, 295; commands Edward de Balliol to return to England, 297; abdication of, 305

Edward III., succeeds to the

throne, 305 ; confirms the truce made by his father, 306 ; commands an army against the Scots, 310 ; proclamation of, during campaign against the Scots, 311 ; failure of Scottish campaign of, 318 ; issues letters of protection to Douglas on his mission to the Holy Land, 359

Elgin, Edward I. at, 79

Elizabeth, wife of Bruce, death of, 329 ; incidents in the life of, 330

Eric, King of Norway, negotiations between Edward I. as to the marriage between Princess Margaret and Prince Edward, 42 ; sends plenipotentiaries to England to confer as to the succession of Princess Margaret, *ib.* ; claim to the Scottish succession by, 58

Exchequer Rolls, evidence regarding Bruce's work in the, 299

## F

Fabyan, story of Bruce's sojourn in Norway by, 145

Falaise, treaty of, 56

Falkirk, battle of, 96-98

Fife, English invaders in, 251

Flanders, expedition by Edward I. to, 89

Flemings, encouraged to settle in Scotland, 349

Flemish merchants, gallant defence of Berwick by, 74

*Fœdera Angelicana*, Rymer's, 13

Folk-lore, the spider in, 15

Fordun, John of, the *Scotichronicon* by, 8 ; remark on claimants to the Scottish throne by, 50 ; opinion of, as to settlement of the Scottish succession, 65 ; account by, of a plot against Bruce, 275

Forfar, captured by Bruce, 190

France, collections of public treaties printed in, 12

Fraser, Sir Simon, joins the Scottish national party, 111 ; sent into exile, 124 ; execution of, 140

Fraser, William, Bishop of St. Andrews, letter to Edward I. from, 47 ; policy of, as to the Scottish succession, 50, 51

Free trade, policy of, in Scotland, 350

French knights in the English army, 285

Froissart, historical point of view of, 2 ; story as to the last wishes of Edward I., 167 ; description of Scottish cavalry by, 308 ; on the death of Bruce, 338, 339

Furness, the Scots at, 235

## G

Gael, ancient contempt for the Saxon by the, 28

Galloway, struggle for independence of, 31 ; uncultivated state of Crown lands in, 40 ; the English in, 107 ; raid of Bruce in, 173 ; Edward de Brus in, 183 ; an Act concerning, 351

Galythly, Patrick, claim to the Scottish throne by, 58

Gascons, fight between the Scots and, 234

Gaveston, Piers, Earl of Cornwall, honours bestowed upon, by Edward II., 173, 180 ; Warden of Scotland north of the Forth, 188 ; sentenced to perpetual exile, *ib.* ; death of, 197

Glasgow, Bishop of, *see* Wischard  
Glentrool, adventures of Bruce in, 157

Gloucester, Earl of, speech to Edward I. by, regarding the Scottish succession, 65 ; counsels flight of Bruce from Eng-

- land, 128 ; appointed Captain-General of the English forces in Scotland, 187 ; at the battle of Bannockburn, 206 *et seq.* ; death of, 219
- Gray, Sir Thomas (senior), warlike distinction of, 4 ; taken prisoner at the battle of Bannockburn, 208
- Gray, Sir Thomas, authorship of the *Scalacronica*, 5 ; warlike experiences of, *ib.* ; narration of Bruce's flight from England, 129 ; story of the assassination of Comyn, *ib.*
- Great Britain, the printing of public treaties in, 12
- Guacelin, Cardinal, sent to excommunicate Bruce, 251
- Guardians, Scottish, six appointed, 39 ; number of, reduced to four, 41 ; meeting of the, with Edward I. and Eric of Norway, 42 ; dissensions between the, 50 ; besiege Stirling Castle, 104
- H
- Haco, King of Norway, defeat of, 33
- Hailes, Lord, deceived by Barbour's inaccuracies, 7 ; the *Annals* by, 13 ; praiseworthy historical researches of, *ib.* ; Sir Walter Scott on, *ib.* ; remarks on the conferences between Scottish nobles and Edward I., 60 ; opinion of, regarding Bruce's claim to the Scottish throne, 66 ; on the letter of the cardinals to the Pope, regarding Bruce, 251-252 ; on the terms of peace between Bruce and Edward II., 254 ; on summary of provisions of English Parliament at Northampton, 324, 325
- Haliburton, Ralf de, betrayer of Wallace, 117
- Harcia, Sir Andrew de, gallant defence of Carlisle by, 231 ; makes an agreement with Bruce, 287 ; arrested by Edward II., 289 ; trial of, *ib.* ; execution of, 290
- Hardy, Sir T. D., historical labours of, 3
- Harry, Blind, inaccuracy of the poem on Wallace by, 82, 84
- Hartlepool, messengers to King Eric of Norway sail from, 46 ; Douglas occupies, 231 ; in terror of the Scots, 258
- Hastings, Sir John de, a claimant to the Scottish throne, 56
- Haye, Sir Gilbert de la, denounced a traitor by Edward I., 134 ; appointed a commissioner by Bruce to treat for peace with Edward II., 227
- Hemingburgh, Walter of, value of the writings of, 3 ; on Bruce's relations with Wallace, 85 ; graphic description of the battle of Falkirk by, 96
- Heraldry in the time of Edward I., 105
- Hertford, imprisonment of de Balliol at, 78
- Hexham, burnt by the Scots, 72 ; curious protection granted to, 94
- Highlanders, bravery of, at the battle of Biland, 284
- Highlands, free from the English, 104 ; Bruce's plans for defence of the, 299
- Holinshed, description of the English soldiers by, 309
- Holland, Count of, a claimant to the Scottish throne, 56
- Holyrood, sack of, 282
- Homage, claim by Henry III. for, from Scotland, 35 ; instances of, done by Kings of Scotland to those of England, commanded to be read by Edward I. at a conference at Norham, 56 ; done by de Bal-



- liol, 68 ; done by James the Steward, 142  
 Hume, David, silence of, regarding Bruce's claim to the Scottish throne, 66  
 Hume, of Godscroft, anecdote of Sir James Douglas by, 16  
 Huntingdon, David I. and the earldom of, 31

## I

- Inchaffray, Abbot of, at the battle of Bannockburn, 213  
 Inchcolm, Abbot of, *see* Bower  
 Ingibiorg, Princess, marriage to Malcolm Canmore of, 24  
 Innes, Cosmo, edition of Barbour's *Brus* by, 6  
 Ireland, Edward I. collects supplies in, 105 ; campaign of Edward de Brus in, 236-244 ; famine in, 237 ; Bruce arrives in, 239 ; Bruce's march through, *ib.*-244 ; supposed second expedition of Bruce into, 319  
 Irvine, surrendered to the English, 87  
 Itchenstoke, Edward I. hears of the coronation of Bruce at, 132

## J

- Jedburgh Castle, Parliament at Westminster makes provision for the safe custody of, 123  
 Jedworth Forest, English attempt to level, 247  
 Justiciaries, appointment of, in Scotland, 123

## K

- Keith, Sir Robert de, appointed warden of Selkirk Forest, 102 ; leads a cavalry charge at Bannockburn, 217 ; appointed a commissioner to treat for peace with Edward II., 227  
 Kenlis, battle of, 236

- Kildrummie Castle, Parliament at Westminster orders, into the responsible keeping of the Earl of Carrick, 124 ; captured by the English, 131  
 Kinghorn, death of Alexander III. at, 36  
 Kirkpatrick, with Bruce at the assassination of Comyn, 130  
 Kirkpatrick, Sir Roger de, appointed a commissioner to treat for peace with Edward II., 227

## L

- Laing, Dr. David, opinion of, as to the historical accuracy of Boece and Buchanan, 12  
 Lamberton, William de, Bishop of St. Andrews, appointed a Guardian of Scotland, 102 ; deputed by Edward II. to use his influence to bring the Scots to terms, 188 ; excommunicated, 272 ; represents Scotland in the negotiations for peace at York, 296 ; warlike spirit of, 326 ; death of, 335  
 Lanark, Wallace slays the sheriff of, 85  
 Lancaster, Earl of, appointed Guardian of Scotland, 246 ; treaty between Douglas and, 279  
*Lanercost, Chronicle of*, characteristics of the, 4 ; where compiled, *ib.* ; evidence regarding the history of the, *ib.* ; on the Scottish rebellion at the time of Wallace, 84 ; on the execution of de Harcla, 290 ; on the truce between Bruce and Edward II., 306 ; on the treaty between Bruce and Edward III., 324 ; on the Scottish Coronation Stone, 328  
 Largs, battle of, 33  
 Leinster, incident in Bruce's invasion near, 240

Lennox, Earl of, devotion to the cause of Bruce by, 144; Bruce exchanges certain lands with, 301  
 Letter from Scottish laymen to Pope John XXII., 272-274  
 Lincoln, reply by Edward I. to Pope Boniface drawn up at, 108; English Parliament at, 321  
 Lindsay, Sir Alexander de, sent into exile, 124  
 Linlithgow Castle, Parliament at Westminster makes provision for the safe custody of, 123; siege of, 192  
 Lintalee, battle of, 247  
 Livingston, Andrew de, sheriff of Lanark, slain by Wallace, 85  
 Lochmaben Castle, handed over by Edward I. to the Earl of Buchan, 77; imprisonment of Scottish hostages in, 100; siege of, by Bruce, 102; forfeited to England, 133; captured by the English, 139  
 Lomond, Loch, Bruce's retreat on an island in, 145  
 London, de Balliol summoned by Edward I. to, 70; trial of Wallace in, 118  
 Lorn, John of, opposition to Bruce by, 152-156; captures the Isle of Man from the Scots, 245  
 Lothian, the prey of rival Saxon chiefs, 23  
 Loudon Hill, battle of, 165  
 Luke, Cardinal, sent to excommunicate Bruce, 251  
 Lumphannan, battle of, 247  
 Lundin, Sir Richard de, deserts the Scottish rebels, 86; advises Surrey at the battle of Stirling, 91

## M

MacAlpin, Kenneth, the Scottish kingdom of, 22

Macandrosser, attack on Bruce by the, 138  
 Macbeth is defeated by Malcolm Canmore, 23  
 Macdouall, Sir Dougal, defeats the brothers of Bruce, 149; in command of Dumfries Castle, 191; death of, 318  
 Macdoualls, defeat of the, by Edward de Brus, 184  
 Macduffs, hereditary privilege of the, 131  
 MacEth, Wilmund, Celtic rising under, 29  
 Maid of Norway, *see* Margaret, Princess  
 Maitland Club, edition of the *Chronicle of Lanercost* printed for the, 4  
 Malcolm Canmore, defeat of Macbeth by, 23; diplomatic policy of, 24  
 Mandeville, Roger de, a claimant to the Scottish throne, 58  
 Mar (Donald), Earl of, with Bruce in Weardale, 310; succeeds Moray as Regent, 370  
 Mar, Earl of, favours the cause of Bruce, 76  
 March, Earl of, *see* Dunbar, Patrick de  
 Margaret, Princess, marriage to Alexander III. of, 34  
 Margaret, Princess, the Maid of Norway, proposed marriage to Prince Edward of, 42; lavish expenditure by Edward I. on behalf of, 46; story that she had been kidnapped, 49; an impostor calling herself, *ib.*; death of, *ib.*  
 Marjorie, Princess, imprisoned by order of Edward II., 139  
 Marmion, Sir William, adventure of, 263  
 Matilda, Princess, married to Henry I., 26  
 Mauley, Sir Edmund de, death of, at Bannockburn, 220

Maxwell, Sir John de, entertains Wallace, 104  
 Melrose, proposed interview between English commissioners and Bruce near, 188  
 Melrose Abbey, sack of, 252; plan for restoration of, 298; Bruce's heart buried in, 362  
 Melton, Archbishop, English force led by, 269; warlike spirit of, 326  
 Menteith, Sir John de, supposed betrayal of Wallace by, 117; joins Bruce, 186  
 Menteith, Murdoch de, plot against Bruce by, 275  
 Merlin, prophecy of, 172  
 Methven, battle of, 135  
 Monthermer, Sir Ralph de, Bruce defeats, 166; released unconditionally by Bruce after Bannockburn, 224  
 Moray, Sir Andrew de, colleague of Wallace, 84; lays siege to Urquhart Castle, 90  
 Moray, Earl of, *see* Moray, Randolph  
 Moray, Sir John de, taken prisoner by the English at Carlisle, 232  
 Moray, Randolph, taken prisoner at Methven, 135; pardoned by Edward I., 142; taken prisoner by Douglas, 181; reason of his opposition to Bruce, 182; blockades Edinburgh Castle, 195; command at Bannockburn of, 201; bravery of, at Bannockburn, 206-209; with Edward de Brus in Ireland, 229, 237, 239; appointed joint Guardian of Scotland by Bruce, *ib.*; with Bruce at the battle of Biland, 283; goes on an embassy to the Pope, 293; reasons urged to the Pope for recognition of Bruce as King of Scotland, *ib.*, 294; successful diplomacy of, 295; represents Scotland

in negotiations for peace at York, 296; goes to France to arrange treaty with King Charles, 303; invades England, 308; generous rivalry between Douglas and, 312; appointed Regent after the death of Bruce, 358; death of, 369; personal appearance of, 370  
 Moray, Thomas, *see* Moray, Randolph  
 More, Sir Thomas de la, the chronicle by, 2  
 Mortimer, Earl of, charged with treachery, 318; treaty of Northampton the work of, 367  
 Moubray, Sir John de, defeated by Douglas, 163  
 Moubray, Sir Philip de, unhorses Bruce at Methven, 135; counsels Edward I. at Bannockburn, 204; delivers up Stirling Castle to Bruce, 224; enters the service of Bruce, *ib.*; with Edward de Brus in Ireland, 229  
 Myton, the Chapter of, 269

## N

Newcastle, Balliol does homage to Edward I. at, 68; execution of Scottish prisoners at, 141; muster of an English army at, 246, 265, 307  
 Norham, conference between Edward I. and Scottish nobles at, 55; the scene of many exploits, 263  
 Norman-French spoken in Scotland, 34  
 Norsemen, districts of Scotland occupied by, 23  
 Northampton, deliberations at, regarding peace between England and Scotland, 324  
 Northumberland, considered a part of Scotland, 32; overrun by Wallace, 93; invaded by Edward de Brus, 226; a Scottish army invades, 257

## O

- O'Connor, Eth, chief of Connaught, invoked as an auxiliary by Edward I., 198  
 Oliphant, Sir William de, defends Stirling Castle, 115  
 O'Neills, crown of Ireland offered to Edward de Brus by the, 228  
 Oriel College, Oxford, Edward I. and the founding of, 223  
 Orkney, death of the Maid of Norway at, 49  
 Ormesby, Sir William de, appointed Justiciar of Scotland, 82  
 Overlord of Scotland, Edward I. assumes the title of, 60, 69, 70

## P

- Pembroke, Earl of, *see* Valence  
 Percy, Sir Henry de, knighted at the sack of Berwick, 73; encounters Wallace in Ayrshire, 84; campaign against Wallace by 85; created Earl of Carrick instead of Bruce, 133; appointed Warden of Scotland north of the Forth, 188  
 Perth, churches of, stripped of lead by Edward I. for war material, 114; Bruce captures, 191  
 Philip, King of France, secret treaty between de Balliol and, 71; Wallace seeks the assistance of, 103; attempts an alliance with the Scots, *ib.*; secures a truce between England and Scotland, 108  
 Picardy, de Balliol in, 79  
 Picts, ancient territory of the, 22  
 Pinkeny, Robert de, a claimant to the Scottish throne, 57  
 Placita Roll, account of the invasion of Scotland by Edward I. in the, 78  
 Pope Boniface, message to Edward I. from, 108; claim to the kingdom of Scotland by, *ib.*; letter from Edward I. to, 109

- Pope Clement V. issues a mandate of excommunication against Bruce, 186  
 Pope John XXII., issues a bull commanding a truce between England and Scotland, 251; continues to act in interest of Edward II., 271; letter to Edward II. from, urging peace, 277; letter to Edward II. from, regarding consent to Bruce's title as King of Scotland, 294  
 Pope Nicholas IV. grants dispensation for the marriage between Prince Edward and Princess Margaret, 44  
 Provins, treaty of, 103

## R

- Raa, Rawe, betrayer of Wallace, 117  
 Rachrin (Rathlin), Bruce seeks shelter in the island of, 145  
 Ragman Roll, no record of de Balliol's reign in, 77; origin of the, 79; returned by Edward III. to the Scots, 328  
 Randolph, Thomas, *see* Moray, Randolph  
 "Randolph's Field," 209  
 Red Hall, at Berwick, gallant defence of, 74  
 Richard I. grants remission of homage to William the Lion, 32  
 Richmond, Earl of, appointed Warden of Scotland, 172; opposes Bruce in Galway, 174; mission to the Scots by, 279; defeated by the Scots at Biland, 283  
 Robert II., birth of, 230; the Scottish crown settled upon, 260  
 Rome, Church of, enormous political power of, 325  
 Rood, the Black, returned by Edward III. to the Scots, 328

Ros, Sir William de, a claimant to the Scottish throne, 57; appointed joint Warden of Scotland, 186

Roslyn, battle of, 111

Roxburgh Castle, surrendered to Edward I., 75; plot by Scottish leaders to surprise, 101; Parliament at Westminster makes provision for the safe custody of, 123; captured by Douglas, 194

Rufus, William, reconciliation between Malcolm Canmore and, 24

Ryan, Loch, the landing of Bruce's brothers at, 149

Rymer, Thomas, the *Fœdera Anglicana* of, 13

## S

Salisbury, conference between representatives of England, Scotland, and Norway at, 42

Scathmoor, battle of, 234

*Scalacronica*, the authorship of, 5; mention of Wallace in, 85

Scone, coronation of de Balliol at, 68; Edward I. removes the Scottish Coronation Stone from, 79; coronation of Bruce at, 131; Scottish Parliament at, 260, 274, 298; David II. crowned at, 366

Scotia, the ancient kingdom of, 22

*Scotichronicon*, the, 8; account of events in Scotland in, after the death of Princess Margaret, 50

Scotland, early history of, 22-37; first consolidation of the present kingdom of, 33; degree to which the ruling class had become alien in, 34; distractions by the barons, 51; civil dissension in, 76; scheme of Edward I. for the government of, 122; trade with the Low

Countries, 261; laymen's plea to the Pope on behalf of, 272  
Scots, fusion of Picts and, 28; antipathy of, to the Welshmen of Strathclyde, *ib.*

Scott, Sir Walter, encomium of Lord Hailes by, 13; at Douglas Castle, 366

Scutage, remission by Edward I. of, due by Bruce, 128

Seal, the Scottish, broken and sent to the English Treasury, 68

Selkirk, foundation charter of the monastery of, 27; meeting between Bruce and English commissioners at, 188

Selkirk Forest, Wallace's retreat in, 83; Sir Robert de Keith appointed warden of, 102

Seton, Sir Alexander de, rescues Bruce at Methven, 135; counsels Bruce at Bannockburn, 211

Seven Earls, the, ancient constitution of, 27; complaint of, 52  
Sheriffs, appointed over every county in Scotland, 123

Sinclair, William, Bishop of Dunkeld defeats English forces in Fife, 249; excommunicated, 272

Siward, Earl, campaign against Macbeth by, 23

Siward, Sir Richard de, accompanies Edward I. to France, 90

Skene, Mr. W. F., edition of the *Gesta Annalia* by, 9

Soulis, Sir Nicholas de, a claimant to the Scottish throne, 57

"Sow," English war-engine called the, 265

Spalding Club, edition of *The Brus* published by the, 6

Spider, story of Bruce and the, 14-16

Standard, battle of the, 29

St. Andrews, Bishop of, *see* Fraser and Lamberton

St. Andrews, Parliament held by Edward I. at, 114  
 State, peculiar social and political relations of Church and, 142  
 State Papers, jealously guarded before the English civil war, 12; later treatment of, *ib.*; Parliament and the editing of, 13  
 St. Bride, patron saint of Douglas, 359  
 Steward, James the, surrenders Roxburgh Castle to Edward I., 75; sent into exile, 113; does homage to Edward I., 142  
 Steward, Walter the, command of, at Bannockburn, 201; created a knight banneret by Bruce, 213; married to the daughter of Bruce, 230; joint Guardian of Scotland during Bruce's absence in Ireland, 239; in command at Berwick, 266; at the battle of Bland, 284; death of, 303  
 Stevenson, Mr. Joseph, edition of the *Chronicle of Lanercost* by, 4  
 St. Fillan, Bruce and a relic of, 210  
 Stirling, battle of, 91; siege of the castle of, 114, 115, 197; Parliament at Westminster makes provision for the safe custody of, 123  
 Stoke Goldington, letter of Edward I. from, 134  
 Stone, Scottish Coronation, removed by Edward I. to Westminster, 79  
 St. Paul's Cathedral, sentence of excommunication passed upon Bruce in, 135  
 Stracathro, de Balliol's statement on his abdication made at, 77  
 Strathord, surrender of Comyn at, 112  
 Surrey, Earl of, *see* Warenne

## T

Tanistry, Celtic law of, 63  
 Temple-Liston, English camp at, 95  
 Thorfinn, Earl, supports the usurper Macbeth, 23  
 Torwood, Bruce's army in the, 199  
 Turnberry, meeting of nobles at, to discuss the Scottish succession, 41; Bruce's landing at, 148  
 Twenge, Sir Marmaduke de, in command of the English cavalry at the battle of Stirling, 92; released unconditionally by Bruce after the battle of Bannockburn, 225  
 Tynedale, a raid on, 72  
 Tytler, silent regarding Bruce's claims to the Scottish throne, 66

## U

Ulster, campaign of Bruce in, 237-240  
 Ulster, Earl of, commands English troops in Ireland, 236  
 Umfraville, Gilbert de, Earl of Angus, demands an indemnity from Edward I., 59  
 Umfraville, Sir Ingelram de, leads a foray of the Scots, 101; appointed sheriff of Roxburgh, 102; plots against Bruce, 152; appointed joint Warden of Scotland, 186; opinion on the Scottish tactics at Bannockburn, 215; taken prisoner at Bannockburn, 220  
 Upsettlington, conference between Edward I. and Scottish nobles at, 58

## V

Valence, Aymer de, Earl of Pembroke, appointed Lieutenant

of Scotland, 133; letters from Edward I. to, *ib.*—134; defeats Bruce at Methven, 135; reproached by Edward I., 151; defeated by Bruce at Loudon Hill, 164; resigns his command in Scotland, 172; accompanies Edward II. in his flight from Bannockburn, 221; appointed Guardian between Trent and Tweed, 226; uniform ill-fortune of, 233  
 Vincenza, Bishop of, Balliol entrusted to the charge of, 78

## W

Wake, Lord, claim for restoration of lands in Scotland, 367; joins the Earl of March in invading Scotland, 369  
 Wallace, Sir Malcolm, quarrels with Sir David de Graham as to the estate of Sir William Wallace, 101  
 Wallace, Sir William, first public record of, 80; youth of, 82; legends regarding the powers of, 84; slays the King's sheriff, 85; in favour of the restoration of de Balliol, 87; defeats the English at Stirling, 91; recognised as the national champion, 93; assumes the title of Governor of Scotland, 95; loses his ascendancy, 102; makes a journey abroad, 103; is imprisoned by King Philip of France, *ib.*; efforts of Edward I. to capture, 116; betrayal of, 117; trial of, 118; execution of, *ib.*; charges preferred against, 119  
 Walsingham, Thomas of, value of the writings of, 3; testimony of, as to Bruce's clemency, 224  
 Wanton, Sir John de, defeated by Douglas, 175

Warene, John de, Earl of Surrey, defeats de Balliol at Dunbar, 75; appointed Governor of Scotland, 82  
 Wark, muster of the English army at, 198  
 Weardale, campaign of Bruce in, 319  
 Welbeck, Abbot of, appointed to convey the Maid of Norway to England, 46  
 Westminster, letters patent of Balliol deposited at, 69; Edward I. summons Balliol to, *ib.*; Edward I. removes the Scottish Coronation Stone to, 79; Parliament at, 122; Scottish commissioners at the Parliament at, *ib.*; proposals of English and Scottish commissioners at, 123  
 Wigtownshire, uncultivated state of Crown lands in, 40  
 William I., the Lion, fights in the army of Henry II., 32; conditions of homage to the English King agreed upon by, *ib.*  
 William, the Conqueror, compels Malcolm Canmore to do homage, 24  
 William Rufus, reconciliation between Malcolm Canmore and, 24  
 Wischard (Wishart), Robert, Bishop of Glasgow, the rising of Wallace inspired by, 84; documentary confession of Scottish rebel leaders drawn up by, 86; imprisonment of, 108; sentenced to exile, 113; supports Bruce as King of Scotland, 131  
 Wymes (Wemyss), Sir Michael de, obnoxious to Edward I., 134  
 Wyntoun, Andrew of, the metrical chronicle by, 9; minute descriptions by, 11; comparative accuracy of, *ib.*; apocry-

- phal account of the death of  
Princess Margaret by, 49
- Yarmouth, the fitting up of a  
ship for the Maid of Norway  
at, 46
- York, Archbishop of, opinion of,  
as to proposals of peace be-  
tween England and Scotland,  
227; holds a council of war at  
Doncaster, 230
- York, Parliament of Edward II.  
at, 226; English army at,  
259; meeting between Eng-  
lish and Scottish commission-  
ers at, 323









## Heroes of the Nations.

A SERIES of biographical studies of the lives and work of a number of representative historical characters about whom have gathered the great traditions of the Nations to which they belonged, and who have been accepted, in many instances, as types of the several National ideals. With the life of each typical character will be presented a picture of the National conditions surrounding him during his career.

The narratives are the work of writers who are recognized authorities on their several subjects, and, while thoroughly trustworthy as history, will present picturesque and dramatic "stories" of the Men and of the events connected with them.

To the Life of each "Hero" will be given one duodecimo volume, handsomely printed in large type, provided with maps and adequately illustrated according to the special requirements of the several subjects.

12°, cloth, each.....	5/-
Half leather.....	6/-

*For full list of volumes see next page.*

# HEROES OF THE NATIONS

---

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| NELSON. By W. Clark Russell.                                | ROBERT E. LEE. By Henry Alexander White.               |
| GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS. By C. R. L. Fletcher.                    | THE CID CAMPEADOR. By H. Butler Clarke.                |
| PERICLES. By Evelyn Abbott.                                 | SALADIN. By Stanley Lane-Poole.                        |
| THEODORIC THE GOTH. By Thomas Hodgkin.                      | BISMARCK. By J. W. Headlam.                            |
| SIR PHILIP SIDNEY. By H. R. Fox-Bourne.                     | ALEXANDER THE GREAT. By Benjamin I. Wheeler.           |
| JULIUS CÆSAR. By W. Warde Fowler.                           | CHARLEMAGNE. By H. W. C. Davis.                        |
| WYCLIF. By Lewis Sergeant.                                  | OLIVER CROMWELL. By Charles Firth.                     |
| NAPOLEON. By W. O'Connor Morris.                            | RICHELIEU. By James B. Perkins.                        |
| HENRY OF NAVARRE. By P. F. Willert.                         | DANIEL O'CONNELL. By Robert Dunlop.                    |
| CICERO. By J. L. Strachan-Davidson.                         | SAINT LOUIS (Louis IX. of France). By Frederick Perry. |
| ABRAHAM LINCOLN. By Noah Brooks.                            | LORD CHATHAM. By Walford Davis Green.                  |
| PRINCE HENRY (OF PORTUGAL) THE NAVIGATOR. By C. R. Beazley. | OWEN GLYNDWR. By Arthur G. Bradley.                    |
| JULIAN THE PHILOSOPHER. By Alice Gardner.                   | HENRY V. By Charles L. Kingsford.                      |
| LOUIS XIV. By Arthur Hassall.                               | EDWARD I. By Edward Jenks.                             |
| CHARLES XII. By R. Nisbet Bain.                             | AUGUSTUS CÆSAR. By J. B. Firth.                        |
| LORENZO DE' MEDICI. By Edward Armstrong.                    | FREDERICK THE GREAT. By W. F. Reddaway.                |
| JEANNE D'ARC. By Mrs. Oliphant.                             | WELLINGTON. By W. O'Connor Morris.                     |
| CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS. By Washington Irving.                 | CONSTANTINE THE GREAT. By J. B. Firth.                 |
| ROBERT THE BRUCE. By Sir Herbert Maxwell.                   | MOHAMMED. D. S. Margoliouth.                           |
| HANNIBAL. By W. O'Connor Morris.                            |  |
| ULYSSES S. GRANT. By William Conant Church.                 |  |

Other volumes in preparation are:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| MOLTKE. By Spencer Wilkinson.               | MARLBOROUGH. By C. W. C. Oman.             |
| JUDAS MACCABÆUS. By Israel Abrahams.        | RICHARD THE LION-HEARTED. By T. A. Archer. |
| SOBIESKI. By F. A. Pollard.                 | WILLIAM THE SILENT. By Ruth Putnam.        |
| ALFRED THE TRUTHTELLER. By Frederick Perry. | CHARLES THE BOLD. By Ruth Putnam.          |
| FREDERICK II. By A. L. Smith.               | GREGORY VII. By F. Urquhart.               |

New York—G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, PUBLISHERS—London

